23994

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | ***THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE***

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* GERALD A. BRUCE

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* FIELD EXPERIENCE ASPECTS OF SOCIAL WORK TRAINING WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* M. A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* D. H. GILL

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* April 4/75 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* Gerald A Bruce

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ* 8612 - ATLAS DR S.E.
CALGARY, ALBERTA
CANADA.

NL-91 (9-74)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FIELD EXPERIENCE ASPECTS OF SOCIAL WORK TRAINING WITH IMPLICATIONS FOR TRAINING IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

by

GERALD A. BRUCE

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF ARTS IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
SPRING, 1975

© Gerald A. Bruce 1975

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Field Experience Aspects of Social Work with Implications for Training in Community Development", submitted by Gerald A. Bruce in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Community Development.

Supervisor

George Kupfer

A.S.A. Mohsen

Date: Dec. 6, 1974

ABSTRACT

This study described the social work programs at The University of Calgary and Mount Royal College. The aim was to identify essential components of field work that could be used as a basis for developing a field work program in Community Development. Information was sought re: rationale for field work, procedures of selection, nature of field experiences, satisfaction and dissatisfactions with the program.

Three populations were sampled in the study - faculty involved in the field work programs at each school, agency personnel involved in supervising students in practicum settings, and students involved in field work at each school. Information was sought from members of each sample regarding their perceptions of the field work programs. Interview schedules were used with faculty and agency supervisors; open-ended questionnaires were distributed to students through their instructors. Information was tabulated and summarized for presentation.

The results show a strong support for field work from each sample. Faculty, supervisors, and students all perceived it as a means of relating formal learning to practice.

In addition to positive perceptions, the study also identified a number of areas of concern - limited finances, insufficient time for faculty and supervisors to perform their functions adequately, misconceptions regarding the expectations of each group involved in field work, and concerns about placement procedures.

A major limitation of the study was the lack of structure in the interview and questionnaire items and the consequent difficulties in analysis.

The recommendations generated out of the study provide a set of guidelines for developing a field work program. As the guidelines are general, they could form a framework for developing field programs in community development or social work. Further studies could profitably investigate specific aspects of a field program in community development which has been based on the guidelines suggested here.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special thank you is deserved by the writer's wife, Jackie, and by his childred for their patience, understanding, and the many considerations which made the completion of this thesis possible. Appreciation is also expressed to Miss Fen Roessingh for her assistance in the initial part of the study.

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to his adviser, Dr. Dhara S. Gill, for the generous assistance provided, and for his most encouraging attitude. The help given in the later stages of the work by Dr. George Kupfer was also much appreciated, as was that provided by Dr. A. S. A. Molsen.

Assistance from the faculties of Social Work at Mount Royal College and University of Calgary is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I INTRODUCTION 1
The Problem 1
Purpose of the Study 4
Summary 5
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 7
Introduction 7
Apprenticeship 7
Articling 10
Nursing 11
Social Work 13
Adult Education 15
Recreation 17
Summary 17
III RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE 19
Design of the Study 19
Description of the Population and Sample 19
Description of the Instruments 20
Procedures 22
Analysis of Data 23
Limitations of the Study 24
IV DESCRIPTION OF PRACTICUM PROGRAM AND DATA ANALYSIS OF FACULTY SUPERVISORS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE 25
Introduction 25

Chapter Page

Part I - Description of Field Placement Program 26

Description of Administrative Structure and Placement Procedure of Field Work Program 29

Placement Procedure 31

Summary 32

Part II - Data Analysis of Faculty Supervisors 33

Determination of Objectives 33

Finding Field Placements 35

Counselling Students on the Job 36

Meetings Between Faculty and Agency Supervisors . . . 37

Faculty Knowledge of Budget for Field Experience . . . 39

Exposure of Students to Principles and Skills of Social Work 42

Achievement of Objectives of Field Experience 44

Faculty Assessment and Opinion 46

Assessment of Agency Supervisors 46

Are Skills Learned During Field Experience that Cannot be Taught in the Classroom? 47

Field Experience - Just a Job! 48

The Social Work Profession View of Field Experience . 49

The Ideal Agency Supervisor 51

Summary of Faculty Perceptions and Opinions 52

V DATA ANALYSIS OF AGENCY SUPERVISORS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE . . 54

Introduction 54

Satisfaction with Organization of Field Experience . . . 55

Recommended Changes for Next Year 56

Scheduled Meeting Times 59

Chapter Page

Budget Knowledge 61

Agency Perception of how Students View Field Experience. 63

Social Work Professional Attitude Toward Field Experience As Viewed by Agency Supervisor 64

Agency Supervisors Response to - Are Skills Learned During Placement that Cannot be Taught in the Classroom 66

Agency Supervisors Response to Exposure to Skills and Principles of Social Work 67

Summary of Agency Supervisors Perceptions 69

VI DATA ANALYSIS - STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES 71

Introduction 71

Part I - Description of Questions 71

Mount Royal College 72

The University of Calgary 72

Part II - Report of Data 74

Personal Emphasis 74

Research Emphasis and Public Education 78

Meeting Emphasis 81

Writing Emphasis 88

Student Comments Regarding Mental Requirements of Field Experience 94

Student Reports of Physical Requirements of Field Experience 100

Shared Office Space, Need for Vehicle 102

Student Perceptions of Working Conditions - Subjective Basis 104

Responsibility 106

Chapter Page

Student Feeling of Responsibility to Client, Educational Institution and Agency 106

Student Response Regarding Feeling of Responsibility to Self and Agency Staff 108

Student Perceptions Related to Personal Satisfaction . 109

Summary Comments of Field Experience - Mount Royal College Student Data 111

Summary Comments Field Experience - The University of Calgary Student Data 112

VII SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 114

Summary and Conclusions 114

Recommendations 116

BIBLIOGRAPHY 120

APPENDIX A 124

APPENDIX B 128

APPENDIX C 132

APPENDIX D 138

APPENDIX E 146

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Faculty Perception of Involvement in Creation of Objectives of Field Experience	34
II	Faculty Perception of Their Responsibility for Finding Field Placements for Students	35
III	Faculty Meetings with Agency Supervisors Prior to Placement and After Placement	38
IV	Faculty Perception Regarding Budget Allocations for Field Placement Programs	40
V	Listing of Methods Used by Faculty to Encourage Students to Consider Various Skills and Principles in Social Work During Field Experience	43
VI	Faculty Perception of Achievement in Exposing Students to Various Skills and Principles of Social Work	45
VII	Faculty Perception Regarding Ability of Agency Supervisors to Properly Supervise Students	46
VIII	Faculty Opinion Regarding Skills Learned During Field Experience that Cannot be Taught in a Classroom	48
IX	Faculty Opinion Regarding Field Experience Simply Becoming a Job	49
X	Faculty Opinion of Social Work Profession Viewing Field Experience as an Important Part of Professional Preparation	50
XI	Agency Supervisors Perceptions Regarding Satisfaction with Way Field Experience Program Organized	55
XII	Agency Supervisors Perception Regarding Whether Changes Could be Recommended for Next Year	57
XIII	Agency Supervisors Perceptions Regarding Whether Meeting Times were Scheduled with Students	60
XIV	Agency Supervisors Perception Regarding Knowledge of a Budget for Field Experience	61
XV	Student Perception of Field Experience Seen by Agency Supervisors	63

Table		Page
XVI	Social Work Profession Attitude Toward Field Experience Viewed by Agency Supervisors	64
XVII	Agency Supervisors Perception Regarding Whether there are Skills Learned During Field Experience that Cannot be Taught in the Classroom	66
XVIII	Agency Supervisors Positive Perception Regarding Student Exposure to Principles and Skills of Social Work	68
XIX	Student Perception of Responsibility During Field Experience Related to Family Counselling	74
XX	Students Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Related to Individual Counselling	75
XXI	Student Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Regarding Activities of Daily Living	76
XXII	Students Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Regarding Visitations to Hospitals, Court, Homes	77
XXIII	Students Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Regarding Research Orientated Activities	78
XXIV	Student Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Regarding Innovativeness, Program Development and Proposal Writing	79
XXV	Student Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience in Area of Public Education	81
XXVI	Student Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Regarding Recruitment and Training of Volunteers and In-Service Training of Regular Staff	82
XXVII	Students Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Regarding Staff and Volunteer Meetings	83
XXVIII	Students Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Regarding Assignments and Meetings with Faculty Supervisors	85
XXIX	Students Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Regarding Attendance at Interdisciplinary Conferences or Community Development Work	87
XXX	Students Perceived Responsibility During Field Experience Regarding Clerical Duties, Messenger and Chauffeur Duties	90

Table Page

XXXI Student Perception of Responsibility Related to Record Writing, Process Recording and Record Keeping 91

XXXII Students Perceived Responsibility Regarding Interviewing, Assessment, Referral and Behaviour Coding 93

XXXIII Student Perception of Physical Requirements During Field Experience Regarding Personal Characteristics and the Need for a High Personal Energy Level 101

XXXV Student Perception of Physical Requirements During Field Experience in Relation to Shared Office Space, Vehicle, Audio-Visual Equipment 103

XXXVI Student Perceptions of Working Conditions During Field Placement Rated on a Subjective Basis 105

XXXVII Student Feeling of Responsibility to Client, Educational Institution and to Agency During Field Placement 107

XXXVIII Student Feeling of Responsibility to Self and to Agency Staff During Field Experience 108

XXXIX Student Satisfaction with Field Experience 110

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

We live in a period of very rapid social change; in the last sixty years, people have lived through a succession of changes from a horse-and-buggy age to a space age. The result of this tremendous change and progress is an environment in which the ordinary citizen is very confused with the world in which he lives. Citizens exhibit this confusion in many ways, such as delinquency, apathy, and marital discord.

This drastic increase in the number of social problems suggests a need for developing ways of helping people adjust to a changing environment. In turn, developing means of helping suggests a need for appropriate preparation of workers or helping people - people who can identify needs of troubled human beings and assist them not only to cope with their difficulties but also to live full and productive lives.

The last decade has seen a considerable expansion in social services and development of helping professions. Universities have developed disciplines such as continuing education, community development, social work, rehabilitation medicine, and leisure education, all concerned with providing assistance for human beings in need. For the purposes of this paper, "helping professions" are defined as, "Those fields of endeavor that have a client as a primary focus and whose work with individuals is based on a relationship that is supportive of self-help principles and a belief in the dignity of man."

The preparation of competent workers for the helping professions is a relatively new field of study and involves a considerable number of problems. One basic issue relates to the relative proportion of training which should be theoretical as compared to the proportion that is practical. Although for years classroom education has been one measure of potential competence in future careers, it has become increasingly evident that, in social service areas, practical experience in a job setting is essential in the training of competent helping persons. Again, the issue which needs clarification is how much of a helper's training or education should be practical or experimental.

A second issue associated with the field training of helping professionals is related to the training year. Holidays for most university and college faculty occur during the time when full-time summer placements could be found for students. In other words, instructors are unavailable at the time which is most opportune for the close supervision and guidance of students in field work.

Another difficulty is that universities and colleges may require field experiences for graduation from social service training programs; however, this requirement is not always endorsed by provision for a faculty position exclusively for the supervision of students' field experiences. Since most instructors are employed on the basis of classroom teaching load, a responsibility for supervision of field work is often perceived as an addition to a prescribed work load, rather than a part of one's work load. When field supervision is viewed this way, as only a small part of an instructor's role, together with advising, class preparation, faculty meetings, and other obligations, then the supervisor of field work readily drops to a low priority for the instructor.

Limited financial resources represent yet another problem facing field experience training programs. The problem of limited financing for field programs will be demonstrated by this study; apparently classroom instruction takes a higher priority.

Some additional concerns associated with field training programs are lack of communication between agencies, competition for placements in a limited number of agencies, and an unwillingness of staffs of the formal educational institutions to cooperate with the provincial government and/or voluntary agencies. These concerns, together with a lack of cooperation between school personnel and the social services professional organizations in the establishment of a recognized field experience program, all contribute to confusion and lack of direction in field experience programs, as well as poor use of existing resources and duplication of effort.

The above concerns lead to a number of significant questions regarding field programs.

1. If field training is a valid educational component in the preparation of helping professionals, why does it appear to get so little attention and consideration from university staffs, field agency personnel, students, and professionals?
2. Does field training conform to the objectives set for it?
3. Are current field training programs really an educational experience or are they simply part-time jobs?
4. Does field experience facilitate the learning of specific skills which cannot be taught in the classroom?
5. How are arrangements of placements made between the educational institutions and the field agencies?

6. Is field experience supervised by trained and recognized professional supervisors?
7. Is field experience currently perceived as an integral part of professional preparation?
8. In administering a field training program, what are the major problems seen by staffs of educational institutions and of field agencies?

This study will attempt to answer some of these questions through a comprehensive comparative description of two local programs for the preparation of helping professionals.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the components of two local field training programs in social work - the programs of The University of Calgary, School of Social Work and Mount Royal College, Division of Social Services - from the perspectives of faculty involved in supervision of field experiences, various agency supervisors, and students in the two programs. The aim of the study is to relate the findings from the social work field training programs to the area of community development in an attempt to identify a framework for the development of a field training program component in the preparation of community development workers.

One basis for studying social work as a reference profession for community development is that community development is an interdisciplinary field, utilizing knowledge and techniques from many fields to achieve community goals. Much of the social organization theory found in social work education also forms the theoretical basis for study in community development.

A second reason for using social work as a field of reference is that community development deals with similar social problems. Problems of family breakdown, inner-city juveniles, and community action relate closely both to social work and community development, though the social worker deals primarily with the individual within the system, whereas the community development worker deals to a much greater extent with changing the system itself.

A final reason for using social work as a reference field in this study is that the agencies and organizations in which community development students would be placed for field work are the same agencies as are used by social work programs. Again, the perspectives of the community development field training program might be somewhat broader in concept than the social work focus, but within the same agency framework and probably under the same agency supervisors.

Summary

Technological advances in our society has far outstripped social advances creating an environment where social problems are increasing at an alarming rate. This in turn has created a pressing need for people trained in the skills necessary for alleviating these social problems. Along with this increasing need for people trained in the "helping professions" is the recognition of field experience as a necessary component in that training process. This thesis concerns itself with the field experience portion of the training program. Chapter I has introduced this study. Chapter II will outline the research design and procedure followed. Chapter III will report on literature related to the subject of field experience. Chapter IV will report on the perceptions of faculty supervisors of field experience. Chapter V records the perceptions of agency supervisors. Chapter VI records student data. Chapter VII presents the summary, conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Historically, many trades and professions have required field experience as part of their total training programs. Various terms are used to refer to particular types of field experience - e.g., apprenticeship, field work, internship, and articling. This chapter will review some of the literature related to field experience in a number of helping professions. Since community development is an interdisciplinary field of study, several associated professions will be reviewed, including trades training, law, nursing, adult education, social work, and recreation. It is anticipated that each field will demonstrate issues common to all field experience programs. Hopefully, this related material will provide a broad base of knowledge from which to view the subsequent analysis of the two local social work field placement programs.

Apprenticeship

"Apprentice" refers to "one who is learning a trade;" "Apprenticeship" refers to a "state or time of being an apprentice."[1] Historically, the craft guilds held control over entry into particular trades. A child or student would apprentice with a "master craftsman" for a period of 5 to 7 years before being recommended to his guild by his master. Usually a sample of the apprentice's craftsmanship was required to mediate the assessment of his worthiness to enter the guild.

---

[1] Highroads Dictionary, Royal School Series, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., p. 29.

Today, a branch of Government is responsible for making apprenticeship opportunities available to prospective tradesmen and for licensing them. The Alberta Apprenticeship Board also is responsible for determining the academic training required to meet minimum trade standards. Finally, there are provincial training boards whose first function is to ensure that sufficient courses and training facilities are provided in their respective industries. Their second function is to make recommendations about the nature, length, and content of training. This includes determining who should be trained (selection criteria), how (methods), what should be taught (content), the qualifications of instructors, the standards to be reached by the conclusion of training (training criteria) and specific related courses which should be associated with training.[2]

The Industrial Training Handbook outlines five principles underlying the development of apprenticeship programs:

1. The recognition that education and training, during the early years of a young person's experience in working life, form a continuous and progressive process.

2. The acceptance that apprenticeship involves not only the learning of skills but also the acquiring of allied knowledge by further education.

3. The programs of training and those of appropriate 'formal education' should be so integrated that the various sections are clearly interrelated and lead to a 'whole' and not a 'part' concept.

4. Apprenticeship should be regarded as a training period rather than a 'direct production' period. This does not mean that an apprentice should not participate in productive work -- but that emphasis should be on 'training' rather than 'labour'.

---

[2] Beaverstock, A. G., Apprenticeship Training Industrial Training Handbook, pp. 10-11.

5. In the organization of apprenticeship, industry has a social responsibility. The young working group is a most vital section of the country's manpower. The potential of apprentices must be developed to the maximum of their own interests as well as those of their employer and the country. This wide issue demands that due attention should be given to both moral and economic factors. Apprenticeship must, therefore, develop character and be an education for citizenship.[3]

Present-day apprenticeships involve a period of 3 to 5 years under the guidance of a journeyman tradesman, supplemented by annual academic training at Southern Alberta Institute of Technology (SAIT) or NAIT and final examinations for accreditation. For example, according to the Labor Gazette (Canada Department of Labor), a construction millwright requires 8,100 hours of experience under a journeyman plus successful completion of examinations prior to getting his papers. A steam and pipe fitter requires 10,000 hours, as does a machinist, for accreditation in his trade.[4]

Apprenticeship, then, provides a particular type of field experience with a major time commitment that allows a person to enter a trade after successful completion of appropriate examinations. In other words, successful apprenticeship requires mastery of specific knowledge and demonstration of particular skills. To the extent that community development workers also require specific skills, as well as knowledge, field experience may be appropriate to their training too, as a means of facilitating skill development and integration of formal learning with practical demands of their work. It seems particularly instructive also to recognize the vital role assumed by industry in apprenticeship training. Possibly the effectiveness of field training in the preparation of community development workers also will be determined to a large degree by the extent and intensity of involvement of the entire profession, beyond those professionals found in educational institutions.

---

[3] _Ibid_., pp. 296-297.

[4] _Labour Gazette_, _Canada Department of Labor_, September 1969, pp. 75-76.

Articling

It is historically relatively recently that formal education has become the most prominent part of training in the practice of law. Entry into the profession traditionally was through an apprenticeship system called articling. The student approached a principal - a lawyer of merit who could offer experience and guidance until the student's entry to the Bar. The student learned about practicing law under the tutorship and supervision of his principal.

This emphasis on the practical component in the preparation of lawyers apparently was associated with a number of difficulties, as reflected in a special committee report on legal education:

> "To summarize these problems, the expense of the articling system to students and to their principal, the shortage of available articling positions, the increasing use of law clerks, the very serious criticisms of the quality of articling for a substantial portion of students and the unsuperable difficulty of improving and effectively supervising the present system, have brought us to the conclusion that the articling requirements should be discontinued. It should be understood that the Committee still accepts the concept of visual education which includes a period of office training; that only if it can be conducted satisfactorily. It is the failure of the present system to satisfy this condition that has caused us to recommend essential changes in it. added to this is the new certainty that soon it would not be possible to provide articling positions for all of the students that would require them." (5 - 30)

In Alberta at the present time, the Law Society requires an articling term of one year.[5]

---

[5] Law Society of Alberta, Rules of the Law Society, Revised March 1971, Calgary, Alberta, p. 12, Item 62, No. 1.

Concern about the quality of supervision is reflected in the requirement that the principal should have a minimum of 5 years of practice in Alberta.

Some of the above observations suggest that it is getting increasingly difficult for the legal profession to provide articling placements for the expanding number of law students seeking to enter the profession. The employment of law clerks - trained assistants who work under the supervision of a qualified lawyer - further limits the placement opportunities for law students. It is difficult to infer from the literature whether articling continues to be viewed as a vital component in the preparation of lawyers. Compared with the trades, the skills involved in the effective practice of law are less clearly defined, whereas a considerable volume of knowledge and information is required.

Without a clearer definition of the objectives of articling, it is difficult to relate it productively to the development of field programs in community development. However, articling provides an opportunity for prospective lawyers to experience the realities of their field and to establish a frame of reference within which they can relate themselves and their formal learning to the actual practice of law. This sort of induction training also would be appropriate in community development as a means of helping prospective community development workers to conceptualize their field.

Nursing

Nursing is another area which for years has required students to perform normal professional duties under direct supervision. The nursing profession apparently identifies several levels of preparation and, accordingly, the content of their formal learnings and the relative proportion of their training time which is devoted to formal learning as compared with practical or field work depends on the level of training they pursue. Martha Rogers makes the following comments:

> "Three levels of nursing preparation (professional, technical and vocational) require clearly different abilities and goals. Recruitment of students must be directed toward assisting each individual to select the level of preparation appropriate for her. Each level of preparation has its own occupational orientation. Nursing theory, which demands prerequisites of substantial study in the liberal arts and basic sciences for its comprehension, will not be taught in programs designed for a different level of career functioning. Those principles drawn from nursing theory for inclusion in technical programs, will be selected to meet the objectives of technical education and will be comprehended within the scope of technical programs. Similarly, vocational workers will learn those principles appropriate to the goals of vocational education."[6]

In relation to field work, Collins suggests that it is the practice setting where real situtations occur and where students experience accountability for their performance.[7] Her comments seem to reflect the position of the National League for Nursing:

> "Learning experiences carefully selected to show the relationship between classroom, clinical laboratories and clinical nursing conferences, assist and guide the student by: (1) Stimulating independent thinking; (2) Pointing out the relationships of knowledge to its application in clinical nursing situations; (3) Promoting problem solving skills; (4) Helping to increase depth and breadth of understanding; (5) Stimulating the development of essential skills; (6) Encouraging intellectual and professional growth."[8]

These objectives for nurses' training seem particularly relevant to the preparation of community development workers. Apart from specific skill development, the objectives focus significantly on providing experiences which help the student develop a cognitive framework for his learnings - an ability to interpret a problem situation and make an appropriate judgment for action based on theoretical knowledge. It would appear that practical experiences would allow the student to become familiar with the real factors which condition the application of theoretical knowledge and the degree to which initiative and independence, along with skill and knowledge, are required in dealing with problems. In other words, the exposure to practical experiences would foster the development of essential attitudes - e.g., independence, initiative, judgment, confidence - as well as practicing specific skills under supervision. This attitudinal dimension seems to represent a unique and significant difference in the purposes for practical experiences in the preparation of professionals, as compared to tradesmen, whose preparation is focussed primarily on skill development and craftsmanship.

---

[6] Rogers, Martha E., Education Revolution in Nursing, The MacMillan Co., New York, Butt-MacMillan Ltd., Gault, Ontario, 1961, p. 41.

[7] Collins, Mildred, Some Conflicts of Issues in Field Teaching, Social Service Department, Victoria General Hospital, Halifax, N.S., 1969, p. 15.

[8] Toward Excellence in Nursing Education, National League for Nursing, New York, 1964, pp. 20-21.

Social Work

The social work literature indicates extensive support for the importance of field experience in the preparation of students. According to Arnold Gurin,

> "There should be no teaching of methods and skills courses without field experiences built into the courses themselves, and conversely, that there should be no field experience which does not include a teaching seminar."[9]

Gurin's comments are supported by those of Boehm:

---

[9] Gurin, Arnold, Report on C.S.W.E. Community Organization Curriculum Development Project, Paper to C.S.W.E. 16th Annual Program Meeting, Minneapolis, Minn., January 1968.

Gurin's comments are supported by those of Boehm:

> "The importance of field work instruction to the education and socialization of social workers is demonstrated by the fact that more time is given to field work than to any other form of learning activity but one third of formal professional social work education is spent in the field."[10]

Howard Irving points to some basic problems associated with social work field supervision.

> "To date, the major barrier to effective field instruction - a problem that has stubbornly defied the most vibrant attempts at solution - is that it is expected to meet simultaneously the educational expectations of the school and the service expectations of the agency. These expectations are evidently not identical."[11]

Irving goes on to say,

> "If the role of field instructor could be completely divorced from its agency orientations by requiring incumbents of this position to be employees of the school, the primacy of student learning over agency service would more likely be upheld, and field instruction would be more likely to fulfill its vital role as a most integral part of social work education."[12]

Comments by Irving, Gurin, and Boehm demonstrate firm support for field experience but they express a concern about possible role conflict inherent in the contradictory nature of the goals of the school and the agency and the consequent split in responsibilities of the instructor, to the school and to the agency.

A lack of clear definition of field work goals is apparent also in the following comments by Pettes on the nature of social work field training:

---

[10] Boehm, Werner W., The Social Casework Method in Social Work Education, Social Work Curriculum Study, Vol. X, New York: Council on Social Work Education, p. 73.

[11] Irving, Howard H., Social Science Approach to a Problem in Field Instruction, Journal of Education for Social Work, 1969-1970, p. 54.

[12] *Ibid*., p. 56.

> "Supervision could not be content with apprenticeship methods. There was not a sufficiently developed craft for the craftsman to say to the apprentice, 'observe what I do and do likewise'. Indeed if social work is to develop as a profession rather than a craft, such methods would have been highly unsuitable even if possible. The essence of a profession is that its members not only learn an appropriate body of knowledge but that they contribute to that knowledge. So from the earliest days, supervision in social work was seen as a mutual working together of supervisor and supervised."13

Again, it appears that social work field experiences are aimed less at specific skill development than at the development of a professional attitude and approach. However, the attributes of this approach need definition for social work, and probably for community development training as well. In both fields, the specific details of a problem are rarely predictable; the definition of the problem therefore depends on the worker's initiative and his judgment in applying his theoretical knowledge to the situation.

Adult Education

While the training of students to deal appropriately with adult learners is an area which is frequently overlooked, it is very relevant to the community development field. Many workers in community development will play the role of adult educator and a large proportion of their clientele will be in the adult age bracket. In discussing the relevance of field experience in the preparation of adult educators, Miller refers to impressions of professors and students:

---

13 Pettes, Dorothy E., Supervision of Social Work, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1967, p. 17.

> "These groups cited as advantages of field experience the opportunity to put theory into practice, to view new educational settings, to contact adult education clientele in their community setting, and to receive training on the firing line."[14]

As in the previous discussions of the role of field experience, here one of its assets seems to be the opportunity it provides for workers to cope with a real situation and to relate it to theory. Miller appears to support the importance of field work, in spite of its practical drawbacks, such as the added time and expense involved in getting to a field setting, the occasional absence of college credits for it, and questionable supervision in some cases.

Elaborating on his endorsement of field training, Miller suggests a number of guidelines for it:

> 1. Field experience programs should be designed to provide meaningful experiences in adult education.
> 2. Internship placement and program planning should be a cooperative and flexible arrangement involving the intern, the University and local agency.
> 3. Field experience programs are primarily an educational experience which may result in a service to the local agency.
> 4. Regular supervision from both the University and the local agency is important to successful intern placements.
> 5. The added costs of internship to the intern should be offset by a stipend and expense allowance.
> 6. Major field experience placements should be at least one semester in length on a full-time basis.
> 7. Extended field experience should generally occur after basic graduate program course work is completed.[15]

As with the previous areas which have been discussed, the above guidelines offer some relevant directions for the development of field training in community development.

---

[14] Miller, Melvin D., "Field Experience - Preparation to Cope," Adult Leadership, January, 1972, p. 253.

[15] Ibid., p. 255.

Recreation

In discussing the development of intership and field training programs in recreation, Garrett uses a medical reference, indicating that the use of the term internship has been in reference to preparation for a profession.[16] Garrett refers to field experience as an opportunity afforded the student, under supervision, for observing and leading activities which can lead to the development of knowledge, skills, and practical wisdom - presumably a reference to an ability to judge the applicability of particular knowledge and skill in a particular practical situation. Garrett suggests that,

> "It would seem to be more useful to limit the meaning of the term 'internship' solely to the period in which a student carried extensive professional responsibilities just prior to the time he qualifies to practice his profession."[17]

Garrett seems to imply a progression of development, in field training, in the direction of increasing ability to use professional skills and knowledge appropriately.

Summary

This chapter has surveyed some of the literature on field experience in the training of workers in trades and professions. From selected readings related to training in the areas of trades, law, nursing, social work, adult education, and recreation, it appears that there is concensus on the necessity of field experience as a part of professional training. However, the objectives and methodology are not clearly defined; problems and concerns are apparent in each field. The following chapters will present descriptive data concerning the two field work programs surveyed in this study with the aim of approximating a clearer statement of the nature and purpose of field work in social work training and the potential generalizability of the social work guidelines to training in the field of community development.

---

[16] Garrett, Maxwell, A Study of Current Recreation Internship and Field Training Programs at Selected Educational Institutes and Public Agencies, Urbana, Illinois, Department of Recreation and Park Administration, University of Illinois, 1968, p. 415.

[17] Ibid., p. 5.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

Design of the Study

Because the study is exploratory and descriptive, a survey format was used to compare two field training programs in social work - The University of Calgary and Mount Royal College. The survey was carried out by questionnaires and structured interviews with three groups of persons associated with each of the training programs under study. As it was intended that no a priori framework or bias would be reflected in the questions, they were left open-ended, allowing for spontaneous and comprehensive responses providing data on the two programs being studied. The responses were analyzed and classified in an attempt to identify common elements and problems which might be generalizable to the field of community development.

Description of the Population and Sample

The population for this study included three main groups - 1. faculty members of the two schools whose programs were being studied - i.e., The School of Social Welfare, The University of Calgary and the Social Services Division, Mount Royal College; 2. agency supervisors, or professionals who supervised students in their field experiences; and 3. students who were enrolled in the two programs at the time of the study. A sample was taken from each section of the population.

Faculty

Ten instructors were involved in the study - six from Mount

Royal College and four from The University of Calgary. This represented the total population of instructors who were responsible for the field experiences of the students in the two institutions studied.

Agency Supervisors

The people who constituted this sample were professionals from social service agencies in Calgary who had accepted responsibility for supervising social work students from the University of Calgary and Mount Royal College social work programs. The agency supervisors are responsible to the training institution as well as to their particular agency.

The sample consisted of eight out of the twelve University of Calgary agency supervisors (66%) and eighteen of the 59 Mount Royal College agency supervisors (30.5%).

Students

The students included in this study were those who were participating in field experiences in the third and fourth years of the University of Calgary social work program and the first and second years of the Mount Royal College program. Students in both institutions were contacted initially by their faculty who distributed the questionnaire with a covering letter (see Appendix E).

Of 110 students reported active in field experience at The University of Calgary, a sample of 60 (55.4%) completed questionnaires; 44 out of 120 (36.5%) Mount Royal College students returned questionnaires.

Description of the Instruments

Three interview schedules were used in this study - one for each of the populations being studied. The focussed interview was used for faculty and for agency supervisors; it was open-ended, thus allowing for free responses as well as direct responses to specific questions. Students were not interviewed but filled out written questionnaires.

Faculty Interview Schedule

The interview schedule for faculty asked for specific information about the program, as well as allowing for spontaneous responses about it. A copy of this schedule appears in Appendix A. This schedule sought the perceptions of the respondents as to their involvement in the field experience program, as well as their attitudes regarding the success of the program. Of prime interest too were their perceptions regarding the social work profession as a whole and its attitude toward field experience.

Agency Supervisor Interview Schedule

The interview schedule for agency supervisors resembled the faculty schedule. A copy appears in Appendix B.

Student Questionnaires

Two separate questionnaires were used to obtain information from students. The first requested a descriptive report of the duties performed at the field work agency (see Appendix C); the second requested a description of a typical day at the field placement (see Appendix D). The two schedules were designed to elicit information describing the duties actually performed, as compared with the jobs outlined.

Pretesting

All instruments were pretested on a small sample of each subpopulation - eight students, four faculty members, and four agency supervisors. The pretesting raised some questions about the wording and lack of guidelines which could have led to difficulties in interpretation of responses to the questionnaires. Some revisions were made on the basis of this pretesting.

Procedures

The interview team consisted of the author and two research assistants. Through joint rehearsal of the interview schedules, efforts were made to standardize the questioning and recording procedures.

Whereas students were contacted indirectly through questionnaires, faculty and agency supervisors were contacted directly through interviews.

Faculty

All faculty were contacted by telephone to arrange interviews which were taped whenever taping was agreed to. Interviewers were instructed to allow the faculty to respond openly to the questions and to record the responses immediately. They were urged to obtain clarification immediately, whenever it was needed.

Interviews originally were scheduled for forty-five minutes but often continued for as long as ninety minutes because of interest from the respondent. Care was taken to ensure that the respondent continued only at her/his own choosing.

Agency Supervisors

As with faculty, agency supervisors were interviewed directly, following a telephone contact. Again, interest in the content of the interviews seemed high, as reflected by the considerable number of interviews which were extended beyond the scheduled forty-five minutes.

Students

The two student questionnaires were distributed at the same time. The two faculty groups were cooperative in distributing the questionnaires to their students. Because the distribution occurred at examination time and resulted in no response from the University students initially, the distribution was followed up by direct contacts by the research team in their classes and field placements.

Very little response was obtained from students on the second questionnaire which requested a description of a typical day at their field placements. Apparently this lack of response to the second questionnaire was associated with two factors - the extended time required to respond to both questionnaires and the feeling that there was no 'typical day'.

Analysis of Data

The interview and questionnaire responses were subjected to a qualitative analysis. Categories were generated out of the data and used to tabulate it. For example, the student responses regarding their daily obligations were grouped into twelve categories which emerged out of clusters of comments made in common by all students. Information which was considered incomplete or illegible was deleted; information which was very difficult to analyze was categorized as an 'unpredicted response' or a 'candid comment'.

Tabulation of the results was done manually. Responses to each question were listed along with the number of times each response was obtained.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations became apparent as the study progressed. First, problems of interpretation of responses indicated that more extensive pretesting of the questionnaires would have been helpful in clarifying the intent of particular items on the questionnaires. Secondly, the use of open-ended items in the questionnaires and interviews created a massive and almost unmanageable amount of information; more structure in the questionnaires and interviews would have expedited the analysis and summary of the responses obtained and allowed for greater accuracy and reliability in the interpretation of the data.

A secondary difficulty associated with analyzing and summarizing a great amount of data was the risk of losing significant details in the process of simplifying and summarizing the data. These difficulties relating to reliability and coding might have been alleviated somewhat by the development of a system for coding responses and testing it beforehand on a sample of independent observers.

A final limitation was that students were contacted indirectly through classroom instructors who distributed questionnaires. Though the rate of return of questionnaires was adequate (55.4% from The University of Calgary; 36.5% from Mount Royal College), it might have been increased if the students had been approached directly.

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF PRACTICUM PROGRAM AND DATA ANALYSIS OF FACULTY SUPERVISORS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction

Part I of Chapter IV will deal with the first major topic - a description of the field placement programs at Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary.

Part II of Chapter IV will consist of data analysis of the faculty supervisors interview schedule. This material is being presented at this time because a major part of the interview schedule is directly concerned with the administrative structure and placement procedure of the field placement program. Many of the faculty supervisors interviewed were directly involved in the writing of the purposes and objectives of their respective programs and are responsible for the administrative structure through which these programs operate. The faculty supervisors are also, generally speaking, the vehicle through which the program is interpreted to the students and agencies. Their perceptions provide a frame of reference for the later evaluation of both agency and student data. These supervisors have full responsibility for field experience supervision in addition to the teaching of the related methods courses.

PART I

DESCRIPTION OF FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAM

Part I of Chapter IV, in describing the field placement program at Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary, will cover three major topics:

1. Aims and objectives of the field placement program.
2. Administrative structure of the program.
3. Placement procedure of the field placement program.

Aims and Objectives of the Field Placement Program

In order to have a fuller understanding of the administrative structure of any program it is first necessary to know the aims and objectives of that program. They provide the base upon which to build. The administrative structure is then, primarily, the vehicle through which the program attempts to achieve its goals. It is on this premise that the writer begins this section with an examination of the written goals and objectives of the Social Work field placement programs at Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary.

A study of the calendars and printed material of the two institutions reveals a very close similarity of stated purposes and objectives for field placement. In summary, the printed material of both institutions states that:

1. There should be a provision of opportunity for students to learn to integrate and apply Social Work knowledge values and attitudes in a range of assignments.

2. The student should have the opportunity to develop social work practice skills under supervision.

The following excerpts from Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary calendars illustrate the recognition of these two principles in the courses offered to the students in the Social Work field placement program.

> SLWK 1292 - Correctional Field Work (Advanced) (4 credits)
> (formerly SLWK 212) Fall
>
> The first half of a two-semester sequence in which the student gains practical experience by working two days a week in a correctional agency setting. Under the immediate supervision of a senior member of the agency, skills learned in a classroom are tested, developed and reinforced in a functional realistic situation.[1]
>
> Social Work 432, Practicum (0-2-12; 0-0-0) and (0-0-0; 0-2-12)
>
> Supervised field experience. Introduction to direct practice with client systems including both social and societal interventions. Two days weekly for one session. Taken concurrently with Social Work 433. Full course offered in a single session.[2]

In addition to the formal calendar material, both institutions also have printed handouts regarding the objectives of field placement experience.

Newer members of staff are given copies of the existing objectives and are asked for comments and suggestions. The faculty annually discuss the objectives of field experience and up-date information where possible. Faculty who have been involved for several years and who took part in the initial establishment of objectives feel "a part of" those objectives and responsible to achieve them. Statements from the written handouts of both institutions follow.

---

[1] Calendar, Mount Royal College, Lincoln Park Campus, Social Work, p. 162.

[2] Calendar, The University of Calgary, Social Work program, 1973-74, p. 353.

The University of Calgary

> "Objectives of field experience need to be clearly stated and understood by the College or University, the community agency or service and the student. In general, field experience is designed to help the student:
>
> 1. Gain first-hand knowledge and greater understanding of the network of Social Work services in the community, in terms of their operation, their contribution to maintenance and enhancement of social functioning and the community forces which affect their organization and operation;
>
> 2. Gain an appreciation of the impact of such problems as delinquency, poor housing, family breakdown, and mental illness upon individuals, families and communities;
>
> 3. Integrate and apply knowledge, theory and understanding derived from foundation courses and the content areas included in the social work concentration;
>
> 4. Develop some of the techniques and skills common to practice in the Social Work field such as observation, data collection and organization, interviewing, reporting and evaluating impressions both in written and oral form, and carrying responsibility for maintaining time and depth-limited relationships with agency personnel and clientele;
>
> 5. Become aware of and analyze his/her own value orientations and his/her feelings about people and the problems which they bring to social agencies."[3]

Mount Royal College

> "The placement of students within an agency has a two-fold purpose in that it is both service and education orientated. The general objectives of placement for both first and second year are:
>
> 1. Field work will provide an opportunity for the student to integrate and apply his/her knowledge, attitude and skills from the academic courses to a practical work situation.
>
> 2. The student will have an opportunity to acquire a general knowledge of the aims and objectives of the field work agency. Gaining this background, the student may develop skills in

---

[3] Baker, D., Undated University of Calgary Printout, School of Social Work, 1973, p. 12.

working with the clients of this particular setting and should be able to apply his/her competence to the more general field.

3. Field work provides the student an opportunity to practice the skills/behaviours listed in the specific objectives.

The specific objectives of placement may be outlined as demonstrated knowledge and practical skill in the area of:

- the principles of Social Work
- the use of interpersonal communications
- the essentials of interviewing
- a systematic approach of problem solving
- diagnosis and treatment planning
- local (action) resources and their utilization
- the mechanical skills of report writing, record keeping, referral procedures and inter-agency correspondence."[4]

It is evident that both institutions have a very detailed set of aims and objectives for their field placement program. The following section of this Chapter is a description of the administrative structure and placement process through which these aims and objectives are carried out.

Description of Administrative Structure and Placement Procedure of Field Work Program

The field placement programs at both Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary, although closely tied into the total Social Work program, are very distinct entities which have explicit aims and objectives of their own. These aims and objectives are similar for both programs as are their administrative structures. However, the responsibilities allocated to people within each administrative structure vary considerably. Each program has faculty supervisors, agency supervisors and student participants, each with different responsibilities and inter-relationships.

---

[4] Mount Royal College, Course Outline, Social Work Careers - Field Placement, May, 1974.

Mount Royal College faculty supervisors, in the main, have full responsibilities. They handle both an academic instructional course load plus student advisory caseload of from 8 to 10 students. They also serve as liaison between the College and involved field placement agencies. As faculty supervisors, they are responsible, in varying degrees, for the supervision of students while on their placement. The supervisory involvement varies with the agency and the student involved.

Mount Royal agency supervisors are staff members of the agency involved, who have, through their agency, agreed to take the responsibility of supervising the learning experience of Social Work students in their agency. No pay is involved for this function; however, privileges such as access to facilities of the College are offered. Appreciation is expressed annually by a wine and cheese social for those involved in assisting the field experience program.

The Mount Royal agency supervisors are given major responsibility for supervision of students who are placed at the agency. Faculty are on call but rely on the professional in the agencies extensively.

The University of Calgary faculty supervisors are full-time faculty personnel whose major job responsibility is the supervision of field placement students and the teaching of the related methods courses. These supervisors have their offices located at, and function out of, the University. They are generally responsible for locating host agencies into which they can place their students for their field placement experience. Under this arrangement the agency's main responsibility to the field placement program is to provide office space, equipment and programs which will enable the student to fulfill his/her field placement obligations. Agency supervisors in these instances have very limited responsibility for student supervision. They do, however, keep minimum process records and meet periodically with the faculty supervisor to assess student progress.

There are, however, other agency supervisors with very different responsibilities in respect to the University placement program. These agency people are full-time University field placement supervisors and have the same student and methods course responsibility as the faculty supervisors. They are, however, paid either entirely by their agency or have a financial arrangement whereby they receive portions of their salary from both University and agency. Their offices are located in the agency and they function out of that agency. They do, of course, use their own agency for student placements. These supervisors have regular meetings at the University to discuss matters of mutual concern.

Placement Procedure

Student placement procedures at both Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary are generally very similar. The faculty supervisors of both programs are responsible for finding field work placements.

Placements have been found in several ways.

1. Some agencies have approached the institutions and requested participation in the field experience program, offering their agency as a placement.

2. The institutions have approached specific agencies and requested a relationship where they could place students for field experience.

3. Individual faculty, because of a special interest or

friendship with a specific agency staff, call and request cooperation in the field experience program.

4. A combination of any or all of the above.

Arrangements, then, are not clear cut policy arrangements in all cases and this leads to some misunderstanding and confusion when searching for a common basis for the provision of field placements.

In the fall of the year, faculty supervisors arrange a day during which the students and agency representatives meet and discuss placement possibilities. Following this experience, students priorize their choice on the basis of first, second, and third preference. The faculty supervisors make all final decisions with regard to student placement based on student preference wherever possible.

A definite effort is made, by all faculty supervisors, to be present when the student first approaches his field placement agency; however, this is not always possible.

Continuous evaluation of field placement program is reported to take place with students and agencies requested to give written and verbal evaluation at the end of each field placement program.

Summary

In summary it can be said that the field placement programs at Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary have many similarities, i.e., goals and objectives, placement procedure, administration, structure and use of similar agencies. Their main difference lies in the responsibilities given to the various groups participating in the program. This difference has a definite bearing on the quality of program offered at the two institutions. The University program has greater depth in the main because the student supervisory staff are able to devote full time to this responsibility. Faculty agency and student responses will touch on this matter and provide material supportive of this premise.

PART II

DATA ANALYSIS OF FACULTY SUPERVISORS

The data gathered represents the summary of responses from six (6) instructors from Mount Royal College and four (4) instructors from The University of Calgary. Questions in the interview schedule were not weighted nor priorized; however, the reporting of that data will be based on similarity of material. The material most relevant in the areas of administrative structure and placement procedure will be presented first. This will be followed by the material that is more subjective in nature. The purpose of this material is to provide greater insight into the quality of the field placement program. From time to time, in the reporting of the data, personal comments and opinions will be represented.

Determination of Objectives

Table I presents findings on the perceived participation of faculty supervisors regarding their input into creation of the objectives of field experience. Of the total faculty response (10), 70% indicated they had some degree of participation in this activity. One half of the staff in each institution felt they had active participation while 16% of the Mount Royal College staff and 25% of the University of Calgary staff felt no participation.

TABLE I

FACULTY PERCEPTION OF INVOLVEMENT IN CREATION OF OBJECTIVES OF FIELD EXPERIENCE

Perceived Involvement	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Active	5	50	3	50	2	50
Partial	2	20	1	16.6	1	25
No Participation	2	20	1	16.6	1	25
No Response	1	10	1	16.6	-	-
Total	10	100	6	100*	4	100

* Closest possible figure to a full %

It should be noted, however, that new staff acquired recently felt that previous instructors had worked out many of the objectives and they were really only informed of what those policies were. Only one respondent indicated that there was a lack of consultation by saying that, "I have little to say because of a heavy chain of command."

The faculty generally are attempting to build a feeling of participation and meaningful involvement; however, a small percentage indicate that the feeling has not been communicated to all involved. There appears to be a need to establish a clear line of communication with new staff members so that potential barriers to involvement are overcome early. The factor of "feeling of involvement" seems essential to build a warm staff "esprit de corps" and a commitment to fulfill common objectives.

Finding Field Placements

All educational programs having a field experience component require assistance and cooperation from the career area concerned. The legal profession requires legal offices for practice, the nursing profession requires hospitals, so too, the social work profession requires placements.

Table II refers to the perception of the faculty regarding finding field placements for students under their guidance. Ninety percent of the faculty perceived their responsibility for student placement as "active". All of The University of Calgary faculty saw this role as did five out of six at Mount Royal College. The one respondent who recorded "no participation" in finding placements indicated that he was new and that the students had already been placed before his arrival.

TABLE II

FACULTY PERCEPTION OF THEIR RESPONSIBILITY FOR FINDING FIELD PLACEMENTS FOR STUDENTS

Responsibility	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Active	9	90	5	80	4	100
Partial	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Responsibility	1	10	1	20	-	-
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	10	100	6	100	4	100

A suitable placement for field experience should offer the student an opportunity to achieve the desirable objectives. The results of this study indicate that the faculty make final decisions regarding which students go to specific agencies; placements tend to be based on personal contacts and interests. Herein lies one of the weaknesses of the present placement procedure in both institutions.

A heavy reliance on instructors finding placements places the institutions in a position to depend on the personality characteristics of the faculty. If one person has a warm, friendly and cooperative personality, he may have a good relationship with agencies. The contrary may be true if the personality is not cooperative. It would appear that the decision of an agency to assist the field experience program is based on an emotional judgment directly related to the personality of the faculty. Such judgements do not reflect a clear agency decision to assist a field experience program. In addition, faculty may change or transfer, interest may diminish or change, and records may be lost so that consistent communication between agency and institution is threatened.

Agency involvement at this stage would seem advisable; indeed, agency data confirm that they would like to be involved in this aspect of the program. It would seem reasonable that arrangements should be negotiated on the institution/agency level as a matter of policy and that the faculty and staff simply be requested to work out the technical details of such negotiations.

Counselling Students on the Job

Integration of theory and practice is a stated objective of both institutions. To achieve this, exposure of the faculty to the student during field experience is essential.

The faculty perception of time spent counselling students during field experience varied from one and a half hours to three hours formal individual instruction to two to six information group discussions and counselling per week. The University of Calgary staff perceived themselves as more involved with students. This was supported by student data indicating a much greater exposure of the University student to faculty and a much more elaborate set of academic expectations.

Meetings Between Faculty and Agency Supervisors

Agency supervisors in The University of Calgary and Mount Royal College programs assume a large part of the responsibility for supervising students while on their field placements. In order to ensure that the aims and objectives of the programs are being met, the faculty must be aware of what is taking place in the field placements and conversely, agency supervisors must be kept up to date on program aims and objectives and course content in order to make the field experience relevant to the student. Frequent meetings between faculty and agency supervisors would, therefore, appear to be of prime importance.

Verbatim comments from the agency supervisors data are presented here in order to help provide a frame of reference in which to read Table III. Some comments from Mount Royal agency supervisors were: "not in touch with course work"; "like to organize interchange of ideas, also have advisory committee feedback"; "staff too busy to supervise students - need College liaison staff"; "poor communication with Mount Royal liaison - feel should meet once a month."

Generally speaking, the agency supervisors associated with The University of Calgary program were more satisfied than their Mount Royal counterparts, however, they too expressed concern with the lack of communication between themselves and the faculty. The following are verbatim comments from The University of Calgary supervisor data: "would like more communication with school in general - not especially practicum supervisors"; "University of Calgary too liasser-faire - not enough concrete direction - did not know enough about course work to coordinate field experience."

TABLE III

FACULTY MEETINGS WITH AGENCY SUPERVISORS

PRIOR TO PLACEMENT AND AFTER PLACEMENT

Faculty Meet	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Prior to Placement						
Regularly	8	80	4	66	4	100
Periodically	2	20	2	34	-	-
Total	10	100	6	100	4	100
After Placement						
Weekly Contact	4	40	2	30	2	50
On Call	1	10	1	20	-	-
Final Evaluation	4	40	3	50	1	25
No Response	1	10	-	-	1	25
Total	10	100	6	100	4	100

Table III presents data on meetings between faculty and agency supervisors. The table indicates that all The University of Calgary faculty interviewed have an ongoing exposure to the placements and do meet with the agencies prior to placement. A majority of Mount Royal College staff also meet with their placements prior to the student becoming involved.

In terms of meetings with agencies after placement, forty percent of all faculty contacted indicated that they had weekly contact with agencies and another forty percent indicated that at final evaluation time there was a major agency visit for evaluation pruposes.

One-half of the Mount Royal College staff use the evaluation time as their major contact time and utilize weekly telephone contact or "on call" for their regular contact with the agency.

It appears possible that an agency supervisor could have a faculty call him prior to placement, and then only call for a final evaluation. Such a possibility gives little opportunity for dialogue between the field and the institutions. The pressure of other duties especially in respect to Mount Royal College supervisors (faculty and agency), might have a definite bearing here.

Faculty Knowledge of Budget for Field Experience

Budget and budgeting has not been previously mentioned in this Chapter but it is, or course, a vital part of any program. A budget is a financial plan of action and the degree to which a program is funded will often determine the quality of that program. Knowledge of budget allocations are vital to all staff in the planning of their program.

Neither Mount Royal College nor The University of Calgary have separate budgets for their field placement programs. Expenses related to their field experience programs are often taken from miscellaneous budgets.

Table IV indicates the response of faculty to questions regarding budget. Faculty knowledge of financing is limited since only a few have administrative responsibilities.

The researcher found some hesitation to discuss finances because the financial arrangements are of a semi-confidential nature. Also, some concern was expressed regarding the possibility of losing some advantages already negotiated if information supplied was distorted by the writer.

TABLE IV

FACULTY PERCEPTION REGARDING BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR FIELD PLACEMENT PROGRAMS

Faculty Perceptions	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
No Budget Exists	5	50	2	33	3	75
Budget Exists	5	50	4	57	1	25
Total	10	100	6	100	4	100
Of 5 Faculty Members Know the Amount	2	40				
Faculty Members do not Know the Amount	-	-				
No Reply	3	60				
Total	5	100				

To elaborate, The University of Calgary has some monies available to pay for support staff in agencies which assist with the social work field experience program. These arrangements are confidential and may not necessarily be the same with all agencies concerned. Each agency that has a financial arrangement with the University negotiated those arrangements separately and thus, they are dealt with separately. Some agencies participate in field work programs with no financial commitment from the University.

Agencies then are generally unaware of these arrangements, or if they are aware, the details are not available to them.

Mount Royal College Social Work program does not have such resources and depends on voluntary assistance from the agencies in the City. The program has, over the years, negotiated an acceptable staff-student ratio for field experience (approximately 1 - 10). They generally do not want to risk losing such a ratio by indiscriminant use of, or distortion of, the facts related to field experience expenses.

Miller has pointed out,that a good internship program can be costly and time consuming.[5] The time requirements and travel costs have to be acknowledged as realities which must be considered in establishing field experience programs.

Other departments, not so closely involved in field experience as the Social Work program, have suggested that the high cost of low student-staff ratio is not necessary, indicating that internal financial struggles could ensue. The table indicates that fifty percent of all faculty know there is a budget but only twenty percent of all faculty indicate they are aware of how much that budget is.

---

[5] Miller, Melvin D., "Field Experience - Preparation to Cope," Adult Leadership, January, 1972, p. 255.

The financial commitments of the institutions do not appear to support the convictions of the Social Work department staff that field experience is important enough to warrant a budget all on its own. [A clear statement of financial support is not evident in this investigation.] Monies expended on field experience have come in part from the budget for salaries, office supplies, sundries. Where field experience is required for graduation, it would appear reasonable that a budget be allocated specifically for this function.

Exposure of Students to Principles and Skills of Social Work

One of the major ways in which the principles and skills of a program are taught is through the various courses offered. The methods used in the teaching of these courses are also of prime importance.

One can theorize that such and such a principle should be taught in a Social Work course. The question arises as to how best? By what methods do we teach skills and an understanding of principles?

Table V lists the methods mentioned by faculty in their attempt to expose students to various principles and skills in the field of Social Work. There has been no attempt to priorize the listing in any way. The sequence in which responses are recorded follow the sequence used in the schedule.

This table does not differentiate between which institution used which skills. The University of Calgary, generally speaking, used a greater variety of methods for teaching and used these methods more frequently than did Mount Royal College. Here again, one might speculate that work responsibilities on the part of the instructors would have a definite bearing on their procedures. This is further supported in the analysis of data under the heading "achievement of objectives of field experience", which will follow immediately.

TABLE V

LISTING OF METHODS USED BY FACULTY TO ENCOURAGE STUDENTS TO CONSIDER VARIOUS SKILLS AND PRINCIPLES IN SOCIAL WORK DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE

(a)	Principles of Social Work	1. Individual conferences
		2. Intensive reading
		3. Class discussion
		4. Handouts
		5. Case evaluation
		6. Encourage personal set of principles
(b)	Use of Interpersonal Skills	1. Communication theory and games
		2. Intervention skills
		3. Group relation skills
		4. Integration across several areas and repetition in various mediums
		5. Immediate feedback on progress
(c)	Essentials of	1. Tape (video) and replay with suggestions
		2. Process recording
		3. Practice interview one on one, one on two, etc.
		4. Immediate feedback on
(d)	Systematic Approach to Problem Solving	1. Thinking and decision making theory
		2. Case evaluations
		3. Assessment and proposals for remodification
		4. Integration of field practice and theory
		5. Problem solving theory
(e)	Diagnosis and Treatment Planning	1. Case study
		2. Intervention in line with social work ethics
		3. Planning on a larger than 1 - 1 basis
		4. Volunteer involvement program theory
(f)	Local Resources and their Utilization	1. Use of minimum of 20 resources for a project
		2. Avoidance of duplication of resources
		3. Agency visitations
(g)	Mechanical Skills	1. Diary keeping
		2. Process recording
		3. Written reports evaluated
		4. Examinations
		5. High standards of expression expected
		6. Reports typewritten
		7. Data display skills of charting, graphing, table producing

It is clear that many different methods are utilized in the social work field to expose the student to principles and skills. It is also clear that these same methods of instruction could be utilized in other disciplines. The legal, medical, recreational and business field utilize much of the same methodology; only the focus changes to allow the student to concentrate on a single field of endeavour.

The field of Community Development is an interdisciplinary field of study and one could consider the methods listed above as useful for students of Community Development. This is particularly true of methods which relate to communication skills, problem solving skills and the encouragement to search out a fundamental set of principles upon which to base judgments. Maximum use of existing resources is a key to sound development and, therefore, the skills of resource utilization would prove invaluable.

We cannot overlook the mechanical skills of record keeping, report writing, and data display skills which help communication in more than one medium (speaking, writing, drawing, film making, etc.).

Achievement of Objectives of Field Experience

Table VI reports the faculty perception of success as related to exposing students to skills and principles of social work during field work. Sixty percent were satisfied that the objectives were achieved while an additional thirty percent indicated that the objectives were partially achieved.

The University saw much greater success (one hundred percent) than did Mount Royal College.

TABLE VI

FACULTY PERCEPTION OF ACHIEVEMENT IN EXPOSING STUDENTS TO VARIOUS SKILLS AND PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL WORK

Achievement	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Achievement	6	60	2	33	4	100
Partial Achievement	3	30	3	50	-	-
No Achievement	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Response	1	10	1	17	-	-
Total	10	100	6	100	4	100

Mount Royal College faculty are much less involved with direct student supervision and rely much more heavily on the agency supervisor. The results indicate more variation with less feeling of achievement for the Mount Royal faculty, as they had much less contact with students during their field experience.

Both faculties indicated that a great deal depends on the motivation of the supervisor. If his motivation is high, success will more likely be achieved in regard to the exposure to the skills necessary. The converse is also possible.

This study has shown that The University of Calgary faculty spend more time with students, and student data clearly show that The University of Calgary students demand much more than do Mount Royal College students.

Where agency supervisors are paid and have full-time responsibility only for field experience, more effort is demanded. The data does not indicate whether this is good or bad; it does indicate that money, as a variable, may have a large role to play in the motivation of staff. Another study looking at financial remuneration as related to commitment in field experience could be a very important study.

Faculty Assessment and Opinion

In this section of Chapter IV the Tables being reported and discussed deal with faculty assessment and opinions on a variety of topics. Here again, as in the previous data (Tables I - VI) the questions were not weighted or priorized. They are being presented in the order in which they appear on the interview schedule.

Assessment of Agency Supervisors

TABLE VII

FACULTY PERCEPTION REGARDING ABILITY OF AGENCY SUPERVISORS TO PROPERLY SUPERVISE STUDENTS

Proper Supervision	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Yes	10	100	6	100	4	100
No	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	10	100	6	100	4	100

Table VII reports the perceptions of faculty regarding the ability of agency personnel to give time and proper supervision to students. One hundred percent of the faculty felt agency supervisors did their best and were able to supervise properly. A clear indication of support for the work of the agency supervisors was recorded. However, inconsistencies arose here, with the results in Table VII giving a clear indication of support, while candid comments did not support the results shown.

The inconsistencies referred to included such comments as, "Some (agency supervisors) are good, some are terrible, but we need the placement and maybe next year we'll get another supervisor." Another reported, "They are not paid extra so why should he expect blood?" "They give a lot of themselves, but they have their job to do first; after that comes the student."

It appears that when discussing another professional, the respondent may be somewhat liberal with his comments; when actually grading a fellow professional social worker (good/bad), he may be less willing to be definite.

Are Skills Learned During Field Experience that Cannot be Taught in the Classroom?

Classroom learning versus practical learning in the field has been debated since social work began to grow as a profession. Are these skills best taught in the class, or are some of them best learned in the field? Faculty responses to this question are presented in Table VIII. Fifty percent of all faculty agreed that important skills are learned in field experience; fifty percent said they are not. One hundred percent of the faculty at The University of Calgary said "yes". The majority (eighty three percent) of Mount Royal College faculty said "no". As will be seen later, agency supervisors also feel that skills are learned in field work that cannot be taught in the classroom.

Statements pertinent to this section included "Time and costs require that skills be taught in the classroom," "Regardless of design, spontaneous behaviour cannot be duplicated in the classroom," or

"Reality is in the field, contrivacy is in the classroom."

TABLE VIII

FACULTY OPINION REGARDING SKILLS LEARNED DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE THAT CANNOT BE TAUGHT IN A CLASSROOM

Are There Skills Learned?	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Yes	5	50	1	17	4	100
No	5	50	5	83	-	-
Total	10	100	6	100	4	100

The cost of a field experience program arose again here. To contrive a "role play" in a classroom, was according to one faculty, "the best investment of dollars available." However, he conceded that "the feeling of reality is missing, and I guess that's what field experience is all about."

Field Experience - Just a Job!

A field experience is time consuming compared to other course content. Travel is often required, car or bus fare needed, different or additional clothing are often required. Incidental expenses not affiliated with usual costs are often incurred by the student. A student's attitude towards his/her field experience has an important bearing on the success or failure of that placement. It was with this in mind that the question "Just a job?" was asked. Table IX presents the results.

TABLE IX

FACULTY OPINION REGARDING FIELD EXPERIENCE SIMPLY BECOMING A JOB

Simply a Job	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	10	100	6	100	4	100
Total	10	100	6	100	4	100

Comments made included: "some students start field placement feeling they 'have to' but end field placement indicating it was the best part of their entire educational program." Others indicated that work in the field is necessary to "turn on" a student. These results are consistent with the responses of agency supervisors, to be presented later.

The Social Work Profession View of Field Experience

Table X reflects the perceptions of faculty regarding the commitment of the social work profession to field experience as an important part of professional preparation. Ninety percent indicated that they feel the profession does place field experience on a high level of priority. However, comments related to this question indicate some concern about whether or not this priority is just giving "lip service" to the role field experience should play.

For example, agency people have indicated that they feel pressed to find space and supervision when there is little financial support. Also, a student is seen by some agency supervisors to cause more work for the agency staff. "I feel 'had' on occasion when responsible for students in the agency." Others responded that the job of agency supervisor is often pushed on to those who are least prepared on the staff and that "second rate" people are given supervisory responsibility for students during the placement.

TABLE X

FACULTY OPINION OF SOCIAL WORK PROFESSION VIEWING FIELD EXPERIENCE AS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Important or Not	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Yes	9	90	6	100	3	75
No	1	10	-	-	1	25
Total	10	100	6	100	4	100

The question regarding the profession's commitment to field experience generated a great deal of comment from both faculty and agency supervisors. Concern was apparent about how best the profession could support the concept of field experience and still deal with the reality of budget restrictions, staff limitations, facility space restrictions, travel and other problem areas referred to in this study. Block placement as a possible solution to several problems was offered regularly by both faculty and agencies as an alternative. Block placement refers to placing a student in a specific agency for a specified period of time. Such a commitment would be eight hours a day for five days a week for a specified period or "block" of time. The block placement could be for a month, a semester, or a full term, as compared with most field experience programs which include student obligations for two to three hours per week for a full semester. Placements required for a full semester or year would allow the agency and the student to develop a systematic approach to the field work.

The Ideal Agency Supervisor

In relation to the item asking faculty to describe the "ideal agency supervisor", the following statement from the data characterizes the responses:

> "The ideal field placement supervisor must be able to relate well with students, have a desire to learn and to teach, have minimum academic qualifications, be able to serve as a role model, be tolerant and flexible."

Eight of ten respondents stated that sex and age were irrelevant. Low priority was also given the following: to be male, have practical experience, have past supervisory experience and be between thirty and forty years of age.

The data arising from the faculty interview schedule contained a number of feelings that did not fit easily into the tables prepared. This section will illustrate those feelings.

One faculty member from Mount Royal College conveyed a sense of a "we-they" position, suggesting that the practitioner did not view the educational institution staff as current with the field. Another member clearly indicated concern by stating, "Field is neglected; it is a last minute scramble and most placements are made indiscriminately. Field work by its nature can be set aside from lecture and marking responsibilities and sifted to the bottom of the list."

Others confirmed that students, advisory committees and staff have recommended block placement as an "ideal" model to strive for as a partial solution to overcoming some of the practical problems related to administering field experience.

Two faculty, one from each institution, commented that "field experience programs are super expensive" when discussing budget considerations. They went on to comment that traditional scholarly work would always leave "field work" in a low second place and that in an academic environment it was given a low priority. There was also an indication that some faculty perceived themselves as "hat in hand" when searching out financial, human, as well as placement resources. This self-concept does not seem to be supportive of the high level priority that the profession in general places on the role of field experience as a part of professional preparation.

Summary of Faculty Perceptions and Opinions

The data presented in this Chapter reflect the perceptions and opinions of ten faculty members from Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary. All faculty responding were active and involved in the Social Work program in their respective institutions at the time of the study.

A majority of the faculty felt they took part in the creation of the objectives for field experience. A majority also had active involvement and responsibility for finding student placements.

A majority met with the staffs of the field placement prior to the allocation of students and also met after allocation for coordination and evaluation purposes.

The faculty saw themselves successfully utilizing many different methods to expose students to the principles and skills of social work.

Faculty saw the agency supervisors as able to give time and proper supervision to students.

Faculty from The University of Calgary felt that skills learned in the field could not be taught in the classroom; some Mount Royal College faculty differed with this opinion.

Faculty unanimously agreed that field experience was not perceived by students as "simply a job". They generally felt that the Social Work profession holds field experience as a necessary ingredient in the preparation of social work professionals.

Finally, faculty generally were unaware of the specifics of budget allocations for field experience. Also, there was concern expressed regarding possible loss of present funding if information regarding budget was incorrectly reported.

CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS OF AGENCY SUPERVISORS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Introduction

Over the years educational institutions and social service agencies have created arrangements for the practical aspects of professional preparation in social work. The agency may have approached the institution for students or the institutions may have approached the agency for help. Friends and professional acquaintances have discussed placement possibilities informally and subsequently cooperation resulted in students placed in the agency. Placements are renewed where agencies will assist and new possibilities are developed as a result of faculty and students themselves finding many of their own placements.

We are, in fact, discussing a partnership between the institutions and the social work agencies. Both gain from the agreement; the agency receives young, agressive students with energy and vitality and new ideas, the institution gains a placement for the student practitioner. The student hopefully gains most; he gains an agency environment that accepts him as a student and allows him to sample 'reality' under supervision, plus experience of an education institution working in harmony with the field.

It becomes apparent then that the agencies and their staff play an important role in the field placement program. This chapter, therefore, concerns itself with agency attitudes and opinions on the field placement program of which they are a part. The data being presented was obtained from the agency supervisors interview schedules and covers basically the same topics as did the faculty supervisors interview schedule. It represents responses from eighteen Mount Royal College agency supervisors and eight University of Calgary agency supervisors.

The questions in the interview schedules were not weighted or priorized in any way; however, the reporting of that data in this Chapter will be organized according to similarity of material. Material relating to organizational structure will be placed first, followed by the more subjective material relating to field experience programs.

Satisfaction with Organization of Field Experience

In association with the question of agency supervisor satisfaction with the organization of field experience there was a notable absence of recorded "no responses." It would appear that the supervisors wanted the opportunity to talk about changes and improvements to the program. They indicated that they did not want to "run the show" but would appreciate more opportunity to discuss the future and direction of the field experience portion of the social work program.

TABLE XI

AGENCY SUPERVISORS PERCEPTIONS REGARDING SATISFACTION WITH WAY FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAM ORGANIZED

Satisfied	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	10	38	6	34	4	50
No	16	62	12	66	4	50
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	26	100	18	100	8	100

Table XI indicates that sixty two percent of the total respondents were unhappy with the organization of the field experience program.

Those supervisors who were happy with the program made few comments. However, those supervisors who were unhappy listed the following reasons for their dissatisfaction. Seven mentioned "haphazard organization" and five referred to "poor communication." Three specifically indicated a desire for "more agency and student participation in selection of placement." A preference for block placements was mentioned by two respondents. A final comment related to students - there were four supervisors who mentioned "unreliable students" and "exaggerated expectation of students" as reasons they were unhappy with the organizational arrangements between the agency and the institutions.

It is possible that the latter comments occur when an agency supervisor has unrealistic expectations of the students, and few guidelines against which to measure the student. Interviews clearly indicated that some conceptual confusion was evident. Several supervisors saw the placement as a "work" exercise for the students while others saw the experience as a "learning" exercise. This created a confusion of expectations by the supervisors with regard to student performance. This area of concern arose in the review of literature. It is also evident in the chapter reporting student data as some students were unsure of the agency expectations of them in their placement.

Recommended Changes for Next Year

The question concerning recommended changes in the field placement program for next year was well received and responded to by the agency supervisors. This area of the study is extremely significant because the attitudes expressed are those of the people most closely involved in field experience training. It was felt that this topic was of major importance in the evaluation of the field experience program and would provide considerable insight into the areas of the program that were of concern to the agency people. The question of "changes for the future" followed and also received considerable attention.

Table XII indicates that eighty percent of the total respondents would recommend some change for the next year. Here again, more agency and student participation in placement selection and a desire for block placements were the most frequent desired changes by Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary supervisors. Clarification of agency expectations was also an area of concern.

TABLE XII

AGENCY SUPERVISORS PERCEPTION REGARDING WHETHER CHANGES COULD BE RECOMMENDED FOR NEXT YEAR

Recommended Changes	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Yes	21	80	14	78	7	87.5
No	3	12	2	11	1	12.5
No Response	2	8	2	11	-	-
Total	26	100	18	100	8	100

Specific data show that eight (thirty percent) agency supervisors said they would prefer block placements to the present system. Eight also indicated that they wanted to see more time made available for agency and student interaction to better facilitate a suitable placement.

Three Mount Royal College supervisors expressed the opinion that there should be an organized exchange of opinions between the agency supervisors and faculty. This comment arose when mentioning that a "wine and cheese" get-together also acted as a partial evaluation. One summarized several similar comments by saying "we want to talk about some of the real problems of field work, we don't need wine and cheese."

Three agency supervisors also stated that better screening of students was necessary and that a failing mechanism should be established for the field experience portion of the Social Work program. This reflects a major concern related to whether a student should be graded during field experience and, if so, who should be responsible for such decisions - the faculty or the agency supervisors in the field. Again, grading depends on the establishment of clear criteria of field work expectations.

Of the concerns mentioned in the data, the question of criteria for a pass/fail in field experience is the most crucial. To define such criteria would require specifically defining many other details which would include:

- type of placement
- role of agency supervisor
- role of student
- role of faculty
- pass/fail mechanism, criteria of
- methodology and system for placement of student with an agency.

Clear definition of these areas would seem to require that all parties come together in public and work out the details of field experience. It seems likely that commitments to field experience undertaken in public would more likely be honored than commitments undertaken in private with few knowing the details of such commitments.

Additional comments by Mount Royal College supervisors indicate that the supervisors themselves differed in their attitudes regarding what the purpose of a practicum experience should be. One supervisor wrote, "practicum attitude - apply social work skills"; another wrote, "shouldn't be a placement ot practice skills - should be exposure to reality;" still another wrote, "it is supposed to be a work experience with work responsibilities involved." This variety of comments supports the suggestion that a "coming together" of all involved in field experience is necessary to the effective functioning of field experience programs.

Scheduled Meeting Times

It seems plausible that the quality of a student experience will be related to the time a supervisor has to give to the student; further, it seems reasonable that a field experience would be richer for the student and the agency if regular meetings were scheduled to discuss the relationship between theory and practice. In other words, by allowing for the "integration" of formal and practical learnings, these meetings would play an important role in the development of a student's professional attitude.

Table XIII deals with the scheduling of supervisor and student meeting times. Data show that the majority of meetings between supervisors and students were scheduled. The University of Calgary supervisors maintained definite meeting schedules - "all meetings scheduled - required", "group meetings yes, also appointments made ahead of time." Mount Royal College supervisors indicated more flexibility in their scheduling - "in a sense supervisor had specific hours", or "for first few weeks, then informal;" one commented he "tried", another said "no specific time, it varied with staff person." It will be recalled that faculty saw the agency supervisor as being able and willing to give the time necessary for proper supervision of students (Chapter IV). As will be apparent later, in the student data, the greater degree of structure by The University of Calgary supervisors is associated with a corresponding difference in student perceptions. The University of Calgary students perceived a much more demanding relationship with their supervisors than did the Mount Royal College students (Chapter VI).

TABLE XIII

AGENCY SUPERVISORS PERCEPTIONS REGARDING WHETHER MEETING TIMES WERE SCHEDULED WITH STUDENTS

Were Meetings Scheduled	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	12	65	12	66	5	62.5
No	6	23	4	22	2	25.0
Yes and No	2	8	1	6	1	12.5
No Response	1	4	1	6	-	-
Total	26	100	18	100	8	100

Student data did not indicate that more supervisor time available to students meant more satisfaction with field experience. In fact, the university student data suggests they would have preferred less attention from their academic supervisors.

Budget Knowledge

Table XIV reflects agency supervisors knowledge of field placement budget within their own agency. This table indicates that only nineteen percent of all supervisors were aware of a budget allowance. The University of Calgary supervisors were somewhat more knowledgeable with thirty-seven and a half percent responding positively as compared with only eleven percent of Mount Royal College supervisors.

TABLE XIV

AGENCY SUPERVISORS PERCEPTION REGARDING KNOWLEDGE OF A BUDGET FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Knowledge	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	5	19	2	11	3	37.5
No	19	73	15	83	4	50.0
No Response	2	8	1	6	1	12.5
Total	26	100	18	100	8	100.0

The written comments by the supervisors indicate that where there is a budget allowed, it is, in most cases, very minimal. Most agencies apparently had no budget specifically for the field experience program, miscellaneous expenses generally being absorbed by "staff training" or "workshop" budgets. However, agency supervisors for The University of Calgary were paid to be full-time supervisors for the field program. Their salaries were paid by The University or by the host agency or a combination of the two. Undoubtedly a full-time salary would have considerable bearing on the amount of time available for each student.

The following are examples of some of the comments regarding budget structure: "pick up incidental only", "not shown in budget as field placement responsibilities", "incidentals out of petty cash", "salary of staff includes field placement responsibilities."

Budget restrictions were mentioned by Mount Royal College faculty as a limitation and some concern was expressed that the present funding may be eroded. Agency supervisors commented that "we could do a better job if we had a full-time field experience person."

Budget is a concern to both faculty and agency supervisors. It is the author's feeling that a firm financial base is necessary to develop a strong and viable field experience program. A firm financial base would also give faculty and agency supervisors a greater feeling of security when planning the field experience program.

To achieve this end, specific budgets for the field experience portions of courses required for graduation should be struck. Without a financial base, all arrangements and efforts toward cooperation and trust between institutions and agencies could be severed by one administrative financial decision. A decision to cut expenses by reducing monies available to field experience programs would undermine an already shaky base.

Agency Perception of how Students View Field Experience

Table XV records agency supervisors responses regarding student attitude towards their placement experience. They felt that, in the majority of cases, students were enthusiastic and enjoyed their placements and considered the experience an educational one. This perception is reflected by one hundred percent of The University of Calgary agency supervisors' responses and eighty three percent of the Mount Royal College agency supervisors' responses. Faculty data reported earlier supported the concensus that students saw the field experience as more than "just a job." The written comments by the supervisors support this contention. University of Calgary agency supervisors wrote such comments as, "most students want and enjoy placement," and "field experience is viewed as an educational experience." Mount Royal College supervisors offered comments which were more varied. While five supervisors wrote that field work was "looked on as a learning experience", two others wrote, "occasionally abused", and "don't know; it shouldn't" [be viewed as just a job].

TABLE XV

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF FIELD EXPERIENCE SEEN BY AGENCY SUPERVISORS

Simply a Job?	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Yes	1	4	1	6	-	-
No	23	88	15	83	8	100
Sometimes	2	8	2	11	-	-
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	26	100	18	100	8	100

Of course, the agency supervisor and faculty have a direct bearing on the attitude of the student in regard to field experience. A real climate of concern for student growth created and supported by instructors can do a great deal to enhance development of practice skills in a real "world" environment. A concern is raised here in regard to the commitment of the social work profession to support field experience as a part of professional preparation.

Social Work Professional Attitude Toward Field Experience
As Viewed by Agency Supervisor

Table XVI indicates the agency supervisors' perceptions regarding whether the social work profession in general see field experience as an important aspect of professional preparation. In general, the supervisors reflected perceptions which were consistent with those of the faculty.

TABLE XVI

SOCIAL WORK PROFESSION ATTITUDE TOWARD FIELD EXPERIENCE

VIEWED BY AGENCY SUPERVISORS

Important	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	25	96	18	100	7	87.5
No	1	4	-	-	1	12.5
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	26	100	18	100	8	100.0

One hundred percent of Mount Royal College supervisors and ninety-six percent of The University of Calgary supervisors felt that field work experience was important to the social work profession. Comments such as "most definitely essential" and "could be one of the most important experiences in social work" illustrate a strong support for the value of field experience.

Two comments offered indicated that field experience was not really accepted by the profession. One Mount Royal College supervisor commented, "some professionals pay lip service." A University of Calgary supervisor stated "no, because of emphasis on learning and academics." Although this attitude was mentioned by a very limited number, it is possible that the "lip service" comment could refer to a desire of an individual or profession to appear supportive but not have a commitment to be supportive. The willingness of an agency to open its doors to a student, take responsibility for supervising him, offer valuable experience to that student, is support. The agencies in the City of Calgary supply placements for all of the social work students, and students of other disciplines with very little asked in return. In other words, the social work agencies in this city have demonstrated a professional commitment to the preparation of professionals for their field.

Time to integrate theory and practice was mentioned to the author during an interview with Extension Education staff in Edmonton who assist with the Community Development Program. Mr. McDonald[1] placed great emphasis on "time to integrate" and suggested that this may be a prime objective of a field experience program.

---

[1] McDonald, Merrill, Extension Education Division, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Personal Conversation, May, 1974.

Agency Supervisors Response to - Are Skills Learned During Placement that Cannot be Taught in the Classroom

With the question of professional support of field experience comes a query relating to the value of field experience - are there skills learned during field placement that cannot be taught in the classroom?

TABLE XVII

AGENCY SUPERVISORS PERCEPTIONS REGARDING WHETHER THERE ARE SKILLS LEARNED DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE THAT CANNOT BE TAUGHT IN THE CLASSROOM

Skills Learned	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	26	100	18	100	8	100
No	-	-	-	-	-	-
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	26	100	18	100	8	100

Table XVII indicates that all of the agency supervisors felt that a field experience for students allows for learnings which cannot take place in the classroom. One of the most frequently mentioned values of a field placement experience was that it allowed the student to experience the reality of the field and thereby help in the integration of and understanding of the theories and concepts taught in the classroom. "Vital", "definitely" and "most important" were some of the most repeated phrases used in response to this question. "Practice skills of interviewing" and "learning to be aware of different values" were mentioned specifically in comments related to this question; "Administrative procedures associated with the social work field and related disciplines cannot be understood or dealt with other than in the real environment." One agency supervisor remarked that "practice is different, awareness and appropriate behaviour are difficult at times." A majority agree that field experience does allow for learning skills related to reality and dealing with the real world of work.

Responses seem to indicate that the supervisors were not as concerned with the teaching or not teaching of actual social work skills as they were with providing "real" environment in which to practice these skills - in other words, an opportunity to test the applicability of specific skills in particular contexts. Skills per se may be taught in classroom but internalizing the "feeling" of a real environment and the ability to select and use skills appropriately in that environment are the keys to field experience.

Agency Supervisors Response to Exposure to Skills and Principles of Social Work

Data was sought regarding the agency supervisor's opinion of student exposure to social work principles and Table XVIII presents the responses associated with six specific social work skill areas.

Analysis of data clearly shows that 90% of the agency supervisors felt that their students were exposed to all of the skills and principles of social work listed. Mount Royal College agency supervisors, however, indicated that their students were not extensively exposed to diagnosis and treatment planning (eighty-three percent). Here again, diagnosis and treatment planning responsibility did not appear to be heavily weighted in their field experience. They indicated, rather, a high student exposure to such activities as intake interviews, supervision of children and getting to know clients on an informal (chatting) basis.

TABLE XVIII

AGENCY SUPERVISORS POSITIVE PERCEPTION REGARDING STUDENT EXPOSURE TO PRINCIPLES AND SKILLS OF SOCIAL WORK

Exposure to:	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Social work principles	24	92	17	94	7	87.5
Use of inter-personal skills	25	96	18	100	7	87.5
Essentials of interviewing	24	92	17	94	7	87.5
Problem solving	24	92	17	94	7	87.5
Diagnosis and treatment planning	22	84	15	83	7	87.5
Resource utilization	22	84	17	94	5	62.5

There is some indication by Mount Royal College supervisors that student exposure to the various skills varied with their placement. Some supervisors stated that their students had case load and counselling responsibilities while others stated that exposure "depended on where student was placed."

The University of Calgary students, on the other hand, carried extensive case work responsibilities under close supervision. In the author's opinion, this is one of the major differences in field experience between Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary social work programs.

Summary of Agency Supervisors Perceptions

The reported perceptions of agency supervisors indicates that they saw success in exposing students to the principles of social work and skills related to the field; they unanimously supported the contention that there are skills learned in the field experience that cannot be taught in the classroom. They refer specifically to the "reality factor" in field experience.

The agency supervisors expressed a lack of knowledge for budget allocations as did faculty respondents, but indicated they felt the social work profession as a whole saw field experience as an important aspect of professional preparation.

The majority of the agency supervisors scheduled meetings with students and did not feel the student perceived his role in field experience simply as a job. Some mention was made, however, of the possibility that a minority of students do take advantage of the field experience program.

The agency supervisors expressed some dissatisfaction with the organization of the field experience program because of poor communication, haphazard organization, limited agency input and little time to meet and choose students. A majority of the agency supervisors felt changes should be made and suggested a block placement to overcome many administrative problems, greater agency involvement in placing students, and a better selection and screening process of students prior to placement and more time for the student to learn about a potential agency placement.

We can now begin to see that faculty and agency supervisors, although they each have concerns, generally view the field experience program in a similar and fairly positive frame of reference. There is, however, an indicated need for increased communication between the two parties so that concerns regarding the field experience program can be expressed and dealt with. Despite this need for increased communication, there exists a healthy atmosphere of mutual respect between all supervisors and there does not appear to be any major difficulty that would handicap the effective operation of the program.

CHAPTER VI

DATA ANALYSIS - STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES

Introduction

The purpose of field experience programs is to encourage students to integrate theory and practice and to practice under supervision. The third dimension of the study was aimed at the "student-response" to the whole field experience program. Student opinion of the program is considered extremely important because it is the student who is ultimately supposed to benefit the most from the entire exercise of field placement.

The study attempted to gather data that would suggest areas of satisfaction and areas of dissatisfaction from a student point of view. Given the faculty and agency supervisor data previously reported we see that there are stated concerns about several of the administrative details of the field experience program. Consensus, however, exists on the value of field experience in professional preparation.

PART I

Description of Questions

The questionnaires asked students to outline what they considered daily, periodic or occasional duties during field experience. The questionnaire also asked for students to respond freely to what they considered as "mental and physical" requirements of field experience. Opinions were sought regarding student perceptions of working conditions, responsibilities and feelings of personal satisfaction related to placement. The tables of data reflect the vocabulary used by the students.

In addition to a questionnaire (Appendix C), the students were asked to describe a "typical day" during field experience. They were requested to provide a breakdown of that typical day in fifteen minute intervals (Appendix D). The purpose of this request was to compare student perceptions with those of faculty and agency. Unfortunately, none of the students completed this time schedule as requested. A brief review of the data which was obtained follows.

Mount Royal College

Mount Royal College student data shows that most days appeared unstructured, students doing whatever was required at the time. Almost all students stated that they had no typical day; 5 students indicated a preference for this.

The majority made no mention of a regular supervision time during their day; five students did, however, mention they spent some time in the mornings discussing placement matters with their supervisor.

Hours of work appeared to be relatively short and although record keeping and report writing was mentioned frequently, it did not appear to be extensive.

The University of Calgary

Most students were definite that there was no typical day and indicated a preference for this open format. However, they did have some routine. For example, supervision in the morning, client contact and record keeping in the afternoon and client contact, record writing, meetings or academic assignments related to field experience in the evening.

An extensive time commitment was recorded for supervision or peer meetings to discuss client related procedure and progress. Reference was made again to evening work being required. These observations are consistent with the data which will be presented in Tables XIX, XX and XXI, which indicate that The University of Calgary students report substantial daily time commitments to supervising meetings, academic assignments and client meetings. This data also suggests that an impressive amount of time is required for a student to fulfill his/her commitment to the agency and to the institution.

If a student carries a full academic load and is also required to meet a heavy time commitment regarding field experience, one could question the quality of both his education and field experience. Physical and mental exhaustion is ever possible and could potentially cause a student unnecessary difficulty. If a heavy time commitment is necessary perhaps it should be required at some time other than during a normal semester. A possible solution may be to require a field experience during a semester when no other academic pressures are placed on the student.

Data gathered from the first section of the student questionnaire is reported in fourteen tables divided into four categories. Each category has several sections which emphasize the student responses. The four categories are: personal emphasis, research emphasis, meeting emphasis and writing emphasis. Each will be dealt with separately.

Data gathered from the second section of the student questionnaire is reported in seven tables encompassing three main categories. These categories are: mental requirements of field experience, physical requirements of field experience and subjective comments on other aspects of field experience.

PART II

Report of Data

Personal Emphasis

The category "personal emphasis" resulted from student responses associated with family counselling, individual counselling, activities of daily living and visitations.

1. Student Perceptions of Responsibility Regarding Family Counselling.

Table XIX shows the data regarding the students' perceptions of their role during field experience in regard to family counselling. Only fourth year university students reported this responsibility on a daily basis.

TABLE XIX

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE RELATED TO FAMILY COUNSELLING

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	23	22	-	-	23	38.3
Periodic	3	3	-	-	3	5.1
Occasional	2	2	2	4.5	-	-
Did not feel a primary responsibility	76	73	42	95.5	34	56.6
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100.0

Of the University students responding, 43% reported family counselling as a part of their responsibility either daily (38.3%) or periodically (5.1%).

Mount Royal College students did not perceive family counselling as a primary responsibility during field experience; they in fact reported little responsibility in this area.

2. Student Perception of Responsibility Regarding Individual Counselling.

Table XX indicates that 25% of the total student sample reported daily responsibility for individual counselling. Of that 25%, a majority were third and fourth year University of Calgary students.

TABLE XX

STUDENTS PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE RELATED TO INDIVIDUAL COUNSELLING

Responsibility	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Daily	26	25	2	5	24	40
Periodic	8	7	4	9	4	6
Occasional	5	5	4	9	1	3
Did not feel a major role	65	63	34	77	31	51
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

18% of Mount Royal College students and 9% of The University of Calgary students reported periodic or occasional responsibility in this area. This is important because this table supports Table XIX and suggests that a majority of social work students contacted in this study do not see family counselling or individual counselling as a primary role during field experience.

3. Student Perception of Responsibility Regarding Activities of Daily Living.

Field experience has been criticized by students in the past as "nothing but 'Joe job' responsibilities." The questionnaire results allowed for an indication of such an attitude amongst students presently in field experience responsibilities. Activities of daily living refer to supervision of clients for recreation purposes, eating or preparing for bed and those activities related to assisting with everyday needs.

Table XXI shows that 78% of all students responding did not see these simple activities as playing a major role in their placement.

TABLE XXI

STUDENT PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING ACTIVITIES OF DAILY LIVING

Responsibility	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Daily	13	12	7	18	6	10
Periodic	8	8	3	5	5	8
Occasional	2	2	-	-	2	4
Not perceived as a major role	8[illegible]	78	34	77	47	78
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

However, the data suggest that although activities of daily living are not a priority, they are required by a substantial number of students during field experience (22%). These results do not support the notion that field experience students "were nothing buy Joe boys."

4. Student Perception of Responsibility Regarding Visitations to Hospitals, Courts and Homes.

Table XXII presents students' perceived responsibility during field experience regarding visitations to homes, the courts, and to hospitals. The data shows that visitations represent a substantial part of the student's responsibilities during field work.

TABLE XXII

STUDENTS' PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING VISITATIONS TO HOSPITALS, COURT, HOMES

Responsibility	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Daily	19	18	10	23	9	15
Periodic	13	13	7	16	6	10
Occasional	7	7	4	9	3	5
Do not see as major role	65	62	23	52	42	70
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

Forty eight percent of all Mount Royal College students and 30% of The University of Calgary students commented that visitations were important daily, periodically or occasionally. Mount Royal College students expressed this view more than University of Calgary students. However, both student groups mentioned visitations were daily or periodic responsibilities more often than they were occasional duties.

Overall, 62% of all students did not mention visitations as a major perceived responsibility during their placement. This information could be relevant in considering questions such as extra travel time commitment and extra travel cost of field experience.

Research Emphasis and Public Education

Students responding to the questionnaire mentioned their involvement in activities that were related to the area of research and public education. Specifically, this category will deal directly with reports of responsibility for research oriented activity, innovations, program development and proposed writing and a discussion on student role regarding public education during field experience.

1. Student Perception of Responsibility Regarding Research Oriented Activities

Research of files, library study and doing inventory, conducting interviews to gather data for projects are all considered research oriented activities in this study.

TABLE XXIII

STUDENTS' PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING RESEARCH ORIENTATED ACTIVITIES

Responsibility	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Daily	27	26	17	39	10	16
Periodic	3	3	-	-	3	5
Occasional	5	5	3	7	2	4
Do not see as major role	69	66	24	54	45	75
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

Table XXIII refers to the question of student involvement in research during placement. Sixty six percent of the total participants do not report this as a major activity. However, 39% of the Mount Royal College students did report research as a daily responsibility compared to 16% of The University of Calgary students.

Because 34% of the overall student response indicated a daily, periodic or occasional responsibility for research oriented activity, it seems that training for these skills might be required by students prior to, and during, field experience.

2. Student Perception of Responsibility Regarding Innovativeness, Program Development and Proposal Writing.

The terms, innovativeness, program development and proposal writing appeared in the data. Responses utilizing this terminology were put into one table because the students generally used these terms together where describing their responsibilities, e.g., "I was placed here because of my ability to write proposals;" "My job is to develop programs so that when I leave they will carry on."

TABLE XXIV

STUDENT PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING INNOVATIVENESS, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND PROPOSAL WRITING

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	16	15	4	9	12	20
Periodic	6	6	6	12	-	-
Occasional	1	1	1	4	-	-
Do not see as major role	81	78	33	75	48	80
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

Innovativeness here refers to the expectation that a student should have a new or different idea for the agency and have the drive to introduce it. Proposal writing has been mentioned in direct relationship to the application for government grants.

Of those who did report this responsibility, twelve students saw the responsibility as a daily obligation and they were all University of Calgary students. This may mean that some agencies who have students assigned to them expect those students to assist in financial solicitation. If this opinion is accurate, it appears necessary to teach students how to prepare program proposals prior to entry into the field experience portion of the social work program.

The Mount Royal College response supports this statement in that 25% of the students reporting saw this responsibility either daily, periodically or occasionally during field experience.

3. Student Perception of Responsibility for Public Education.

Public education refers here to public speaking on behalf of the agency, promotional writing for newspapers or radio and television, preparing information kits for special events. Public relations functions such as hostess or fill-in secretary for committees were also mentioned in this regard.

Table XXV shows that Mount Royal College students reported becoming more involved in public information and report it as a more important part of their responsibility than do The University of Calgary students. Fifty five percent of Mount Royal College students supported this comment considering all three categories. University of Calgary students on the other hand recorded only 19% in the same categories, indicating that this role was perceived as a substantially lower priority for them. Overall, sixty five percent of all students recorded no special responsibility in the public education role during their field placement.

TABLE XXV

STUDENT PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE IN AREA OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

Responsibility	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Daily	11	11	7	17	4	7
Periodic	12	12	8	18	4	7
Occasional	12	12	9	20	3	5
Do not see as major role	69	65	20	45	49	81
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

Meeting Emphasis

The category of meeting emphasis includes student data reflecting their response to responsibility in the areas of training and recruitment of volunteers and staff, attendance at staff and volunteer meetings regarding meetings with faculty supervisors and attendance at inter-disciplinary meetings.

1. Student Perception of Responsibility Regarding Training and Recruitment of Volunteers and Staff

Students are considered resources by agencies and as such are expected to become involved with leadership training programs in the agency. Responses were recorded that expressed involvement in either or both volunteer or staff training responsibilities. Table XXVI shows that students from both institutions and all years represented reported either daily, periodical or occasional responsibilities for in-service training and recruitment of volunteer or regular staff.

TABLE XXVI

STUDENT PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING RECRUITMENT AND TRAINING OF VOLUNTEERS AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF REGULAR STAFF

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	11	11	1	3	10	16
Periodic	21	20	8	18	13	21
Occasional	5	5	2	4	3	7
Do not see as role responsibility	67	64	33	75	34	56
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

Some 65% of all student respondents did not report this responsibility as a major part of their field placement. More University of Calgary students (16%) reported training as a daily duty. However, Mount Royal College students and University of Calgary students differed by only 3% on the periodic duty portion of the table and on the occasional responsibility scale. In short, the majority of students did not report this responsibility as a clear obligation. However, the table indicates that 36% of all students questioned are involved in training or recruitment and training of volunteers and in-service training of regular staff. This would support the suggestion that training in small group workshop organization, chairmanship and leadership development would be useful for students prior to and during their field experience.

2. Student Perceived Responsibility Regarding Staff-Volunteer Meetings.

Both student groups commented often about their involvement with staff meetings. They also mentioned substantial involvement with volunteer meetings. All comments related to attendance and participation in staff and volunteer meetings were combined in the preparation of Table XXVII

TABLE XXVII

STUDENTS' PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING STAFF AND VOLUNTEER MEETINGS

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	48	46	2	6	46	76
Periodic	19	18	6	13	13	21
Occasional	7	7	5	11	1	3
Do not see as major role	32	29	31	70	-	-
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

Data shows that this responsibility was reported as important by a majority of students.

One hundred percent of The University of Calgary students stated that such meetings were a part of their obligations either on a daily, periodic or occasional basis. Of the entire student sample, only

29% reported that this function was not a part of their obligation.

Specifically, University of Calgary students (76%) reported meetings as a daily responsibility and 97% noted this requirement either daily or periodically. This responsibility, in addition to academic requirements, suggests a heavy work time commitment must be carried by these students.

One can infer from this table that it would be helpful for University students to be knowledgeable about how meetings are conducted so that they can be effective and participate knowledgeably.

This table also gives a strong indication of the time involvement of this responsibility. A normal staff or volunteer meeting will run between one and three hours, depending on the agency. This indicates a substantial amount of time in meetings and has a definite bearing on the amount of time available for other responsibilities. The point appears to be that a university student carries an extremely heavy time commitment in the social work program during field experience. That time commitment may not allow time for the student to integrate his theory and practice and may, in fact, contribute to the feeling of harrassment expressed at exam time. Data in this Chapter support the "over worked" response of the university student.

Mount Royal College students generally did not share this opinion and Table XXVIII following explains.

3. Student Perception of Responsibilities Regarding Assignments and Meetings with Faculty Supervisors.

Student responses also included comments related to the need to meet academic obligations during placement.

This data is important because an extremely heavy academic load would tend to drain a student of time and energy he could otherwise put toward field experience. Data presented previously in this Chapter reflects the emphasis on academic accomplishment reported in the following table, also data recorded under mental and physical requirements of field experience are supportive to Table XXVIII.

TABLE XXVIII

STUDENTS PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING ASSIGNMENTS AND MEETINGS WITH FACULTY SUPERVISORS

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	35	33	-	-	35	58
Periodic	20	19	-	-	20	33
Occasional	3	3	-	-	3	5
Not viewed as major role	46	45	44	100	2	4
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

Table XXVIII proved to be most informative. Mount Royal College students did not record this responsibility as a perceived responsibility for them. The University of Calgary results, however, noted a tremendously clear emphasis on required assignments and meetings with faculty supervisors. Some 96% of the University students returns reported this responsibility as a key student obligation either daily, periodically or occasionally. Compared to a "zero" response from Mount Royal College students, this is a significant factor.

Data shows that there is no felt pressure for academic responsibilities reported by Mount Royal College students during their field experience.

Where 100% of the Mount Royal College students expressed that they did not view assignments and meetings with academic supervisors as key responsibility, only two of sixty respondents from The University of Calgary expressed that perception.

This Table will be referred to again later with summary comments to be weighted with other data in this Chapter.

In terms of this study, Table XXVIII clearly shows a difference of philosophy in regard to achievement of field experience goals. Students response noted that in the table Mount Royal College staff do not place a high priority on academic achievement during placement and The University of Calgary staff do. Although University student data indicate some unhappiness with this philosophy, it also recorded a feeling of accomplishment which is reported later in this Chapter under "student satisfaction with field experience."

4. Student Perception of Responsibility Regarding Involvement with Interdisciplinary Conferences or Community Development Work.

Students reported a clear distinction between attendance at agency meetings, and attendance at interdisciplinary meetings. The major difference is that the interdisciplinary meetings were attended by professional staff from many different disciplines whereas agency meetings generally had professional and laymen only from that one field, (e.g., Y.M.C.A.).

TABLE XXIX

STUDENTS PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING ATTENDANCE AT INTERDISCIPLINARY CONFERENCES OR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WORK

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	12	12	-	-	12	20
Periodic	22	21	-	-	22	36
Occasional	11	11	2	5	9	16
Do not see as major role	59	56	42	95	17	28
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

The students who worked with community groups assisting them to sort out their own objectives and solve their own problems referred to their work as community development. Their responses were recorded with those who mentioned interdisciplinary concerns and interests.

Table XXIX records students' involvement in attendance at interdisciplinary meetings and community development oriented activities. The University of Calgary students indicate a very high response and Mount Royal College students a very low response in regard to interdisciplinary involvement. For example, of the total 104 students only 45 students responded. Of the 45 that responded positively that their attendance was daily, periodic or occasional at these activities, 43 or 93% were University of Calgary students and 7% were Mount Royal College students.

This Table suggests that University students reported the responsibility of attendance at interdisciplinary conferences, etc., very clearly. Mount Royal College students did not report this role as a major responsibility during field experience and this indicates a low level of priority placed on this function.

This emphasis, as shown by The University of Calgary students, on interdisciplinary involvement would be important to those studying community development. Chapter I of this study suggested that preparation for social work parallels closely the pattern that community developers are following.

Social work training encourages many of the same skills and ascribes to some of the basic principles of community development such as respect for the dignity of man and a belief that through involvement and utilization of the existing resources, men (and organizations) can solve their own problems. The data show that the University students are involved in and have an option of community development whereas the Mount Royal College student does not report the same option. For those students involved in community development during field experience, exposure to community development philosophy and methods would appear necessary prior to placement.

The data indicate social work offers a community development option at the university and encourages a community development philosophy. This is not evident in data from Mount Royal College students.

Writing Emphasis

This category present tables reporting student perception of responsibility regarding clerical, messenger and chauffeur duties, record writing, process recording and general report writing; interviewing, assessment and referral and behaviour coding. Also of interest here was the possibility of recording attitudes of students regarding being perceived only as "Joe boys." Previous data did not record negative attitudes; this data indicated clearly that clerical and other such duties were considered absolutely necessary regardless of who did them.

1. Student Perception of Responsibility Regarding Clerical Duties and Messenger and Chauffeur Duties.

Responses recorded indicated that most students who had messenger and chauffeur duties considered them in the same category as clerical duties. Therefore, these activities were combined for the purpose of this analysis.

Referring to previous comments as to whether students felt like "Joe boys", the writer recorded comments that suggest students feel clerical duties and skills are extremely important. "Without accurate records, how does anyone know what's going on?", or "I don't mind clerical duties, someone must do them and even the profession staff pitch in", were some of the recorded comments.

These comments indicate that a positive attitude is reported in carrying out clerical and janitorial duties.

Table XXX records students response about clerical duties as a major role during field experience. Thirty eight percent of the total population reported time sheet preparation, telephone answering, janitorial duties and messenger and chauffeur duties as a part of their role obligation either daily, periodically or occasionally.

TABLE XXX

STUDENTS' PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING CLERICAL DUTIES, MESSENGER AND CHAUFFEUR DUTIES

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	23	22	-	-	23	38
Periodic	4	4	3	8	1	4
Occasional	12	12	5	11	7	10
Did not see as major role	65	62	36	81	29	48
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

Upon closer study, 38% of The University of Calgary students report the responsibility daily while none of the Mount Royal College students reported the same and 19% reported this responsibility only periodically or occasionally. One may have expected that the Mount Royal College students would have more responsibility in the area of clerical and chauffeur duties; however, the data does not support this supposition.

2. Student Perception of Responsibility Regarding Record Writing, Process Recording and General Report Keeping.

Record keeping and report writing came clearly to the fore during the creation of categories for responses. Students responded candidly that in cases they felt "recorded to death." They would, however, hasten to add that they felt records were "important."

Table XXXI refers to student report related to record writing and record keeping.

TABLE XXXI

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF RESPONSIBILITY RELATED TO RECORD WRITING, PROCESS RECORDING AND RECORD KEEPING

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	53	51	4	10	49	82
Periodic	17	17	12	27	5	8
Occasional	6	6	5	11	1	3
Did not see as major role	28	26	23	52	5	7
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

A high response here indicated a reasonable consistent feeling of responsibility and obligation. For example, 74% of all student respondents stated they had this responsibility either daily (51%), periodically (17%) or occasionally (6%). Students recording a daily report writing responsibility show that 82% were University of Calgary students and only 10% were Mount Royal College students. In the categories of periodic or occasional, however, University of Calgary students show 11% while Mount Royal College students record 38%.

These figures may be used to support comments made earlier in this study regarding university students' perception of heavy time and work commitments during field placement. A substantial record writing and record keeping responsibility in this Table clearly indicates a majority (82%) note records are a major responsibility for The University of Calgary students and not a major daily obligation for Mount Royal

College students (10%).

Record keeping and recording obligations seem to emerge overall as a major area of responsibility reported by the students during field experience. With a heavy emphasis on record keeping, it is clear that instruction in record keeping, report writing should be given prior to and during field experience.

3. Student Perception of Responsibilities Regarding Interviewing Assessment, Referral and Behaviour Coding.

All responses that named interviewing, assessment, etc., were combined as a part of one general responsibility. None of the jobs were mentioned often enough to be significant in themselves but by combining the totals recorded for each, an observation could be made.

This decision was made when it became evident that student respondents often used several of these terms in one sentence to describe their duties. For example, one University of Calgary student quoted: "I do some interviewing and referral to the appropriate agency, but sometimes I do an assessment of a situation or interview and record it."

Table XXXII shows that 40 respondents (38%) of the entire sample reported these functions as a daily or periodic part of the role they played during field experience.

Sixty three percent of The University of Calgary students and 41% of the Mount Royal College students did not report this function as playing a major role in their field experience.

This Table also shows that responses came from both years and both institutions studied. This indicates that these skills are required by 43% of students during placement, and support earlier suggestions for pre-field experience training in skill development that would prepare students to be competent in behaviour coding, interviewing and related skills. This training should take place prior to field experience, in-service and advanced skill training perhaps should carry on during field experience.

TABLE XXXII

STUDENTS PERCEIVED RESPONSIBILITY REGARDING INTERVIEWING, ASSESSMENT, REFERRAL AND BEHAVIOUR CODING

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	26	25	10	23	16	27
Periodic	14	13	11	25	3	5
Occasional	5	5	5	11	3	5
Did not see as major role	59	57	18	41	38	63
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

The second section of the student questionnaire deals specifically with student perceptions, opinions, feelings and reactions to questions raised regarding mental requirements of field experience; physical characteristics of field experience including personal and physical space concerns; and subjective comments relating to working environment, feeling of responsibility toward clients, institutions and agency and comments reflecting student view of responsibility to oneself and agency staff.

An attempt was made to categorize responses from the content provided by student questionnaires in the same manner utilized in section one of the questionnaire. "Like" responses were categorized together and reported in the tables that follow.

Student Comments Regarding Mental Requirements of Field Experience

The writer was searching for response from students which would give some guidance as to the need for any special personal attributes for field experience. This section of the questionnaire encouraged many responses and eight categories were created to display the data. A list of categories created follows:

1. Comments related to student ability to function under stress. This category included comments particularly regarding decision making.

2. Comments related to a need for students to have understanding, patience and tolerance. These terms are included in the author's understanding of the word "empathy."

3. Comments related to ability to integrate theory,practice and knowledge.

4. Comments related to knowledge of the agencies' objectives.

5. Comments related to the whole area of honesty, awareness, objectivity, ability to observe and make assessments.

6. Comments related to availability of students, involvement, initiative and ability to work on one's own.

7. Comments related to a need for skill training specifically in the area of interviewing, public speaking, listening, writing and skills related to communication at an interpersonal level.

8. Comments related to the ability to practice functioning as part

of a team and use of audio visual equipment.

These eight categories are combined for presentation. Each particular response was tabulated separately and categorized in terms of each of the eight categories. The Table shows the number of times a particular type of comment was made.

Results of category 1 relating to the need for stability and decision making ability under stress suggests that 46% of all students recorded saw a need for this ability. Of the students that responded, 79% were University of Calgary students and 21% were Mount Royal College students; indicating that the University of Calgary student perceived this need to a greater extent than did the Mount Royal College student.

This data would suggest the student from The University of Calgary may feel greater personal pressure during field experience than would a Mount Royal College student. This data also supports comments made earlier in this Chapter regarding a "heavy" load for University of Calgary students during field experience.

A separate table (Table XXXIV) reports student comments relating to the need for a high energy level. That table shows that 48% of The University of Calgary students indicated this need while only 11% of the Mount Royal College students reported the need for a high energy level.

The writer feels the students are submitting evidence to clearly indicate there is a great deal of pressure from demands and expectations as perceived by University of Calgary students during field experience. One might question whether the quality of learning experience for the university student is affected by such reported pressure. It is the writer's contention that little "learning" can take place during what might appear as an exercise in endeavour during field experience.

Category 2 results referred to students' perception of a need for patience, understanding and tolerance during field experience. Forty five percent of the total student group responded positively indicating that they felt that the qualities mentioned were necessary for their work. Of these, a high percentage (61%) were Mount Royal College students which indicates that Mount Royal College respondents showed more concern for these qualities than did University of Calgary student respondents (33%).

This response was considered worthy of note because one could have possibly presumed that a social work student with more academic and people skills training would report the need for understanding, patience and tolerance to a greater extent than a student considered to have less formal training.

This comment will be dealt with in greater detail in the conclusion Chapter. The importance of this perception is related directly to present professional discussions as to whether advanced skills training actually makes social work students more aware and more competent in the people profession.

Note could also be made that University of Calgary students focussed on the need to function under stress above any other category, with ability to observe and assess ranked second. This may indicate that university students place a higher priority on their own performance than on concern for the client. One might suggest that this response is related directly to pressure in this program to achieve academically.

Category 3 related to students' perceptions of the need for integration of theory, practice and knowledge. Eighty two percent of the total student population did not note this need on their questionnaire.

This could indicate that students do not see the need for such integration expressed under the title of mental requirements. It could also indicate the students have not yet considered fully such skills as relating theory to practice.

TABLE XXXIII

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF MENTAL REQUIREMENTS

Categories	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Function under stress	48	46	9	20	38	63
Understanding, patience and tolerance	47	45	27	61	20	33
Ability to integrate	22	21	4	9	18	30
Knowledge of agency objectives	9	8.5	8	8	1	1
Ability to observe and assess	36	35	10	23	26	43
Availability, involvement, initiative	27	26	10	23	17	28
Skills training	29	28	12	28	17	28
Team functioning	14	13	5	11	9	15

Of the 22 positive responses, 81% were University of Calgary students and 19% were Mount Royal College students. Such an indication may suggest that awareness of a need for integration of practice and theory develops over time and is not perceived by these students as being important in their early years of training.

Category 4 specifically refers to opinions concerning a need to know the objectives of the agency in which field experience occurs. The table shows a "no" recorded response of 95%. Of the limited number of students recorded positively (9%), Mount Royal College students responding were the majority by an 8 to 1 margin. Overall, the table indicates little significance is placed in this area by students.

Some concern could be expressed here because the agency may expect the placement student to know the agency objectives. If the student is not aware of the objectives of the agency how then can he make decisions that will complement agency objectives?

It is also possible that students responding to the questionnaire assumed the researcher would expect them to be aware of agency objectives and did not respond.

Category 5 refers to the need for awareness and objectivity and ability to observe and make assessments. Table XXXIII indicates that students in both Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary perceive these skills as a requirement for their field experience.

Thirty five percent of the total group responded positively while 65% did not record these ideas. Of the students who responded, University of Calgary students (72%) perceived this need more than Mount Royal College students (28%).

This could be because University students had more required commitments in committee and other meetings and were responsible for recording and reporting on a regular basis to the university faculty person.

Category 6 relates to students' comments on the need to be generally available, involved and showing initiative and indicating the ability to work on one's own. The results indicate that 74% did not report in this regard but 26% did note this.

The 26% responding reported involvement and initiative as a mental requirement of their field experience. The University of Calgary students reported a higher response rate than did Mount Royal College students. The difference in emphasis is considered of little significance but it does suggest that university students feel the need to show these traits to a greater extent than do Mount Royal College students.

Table XXXIII also records reports of the need for skills training as a part of mental requirements for field experience.

The skills listed in this category are interviewing, public speaking, listening and writing.

A high "no response" was recorded in category 7 (72%) which indicates that 28% saw these skills as necessary for them during field experience. Of the 29 students who responded positively, 12 were Mount Royal College students and 17 were University of Calgary students. Thus 28% from each institution feel that these skills are necessary in their field experience.

This means that students would likely encourage skills training at the college or university prior to field experience responsibilities. This is not suggesting that skills training is not required during field experience itself.

Category 8 recorded comments about the need to learn team functioning and use of audio-visual equipment. Students generally did not respond with, or to, this terminology. Eight seven percent were recorded as "no response", and of the remaining 13%, only 5 students from Mount Royal College and 9 students from The University of Calgary reported that they perceived the above mentioned skills as necessary for their field experience.

This means that students from Mount Royal College and The University of Calgary do not see a major responsibility for team functioning and use of audio-visual equipment. It could also mean that other skills are placed ahead of such skills as use of audio-visual.

Several comments may clearly indicate student attitude recorded: "When the equipment works, its fine, it just is undependable", or "I have more problem booking the equipment and transporting it than it's worth." One commented, "give me the confidence I need to be a good worker, I won't need any equipment."

Student Reports of Physical Requirements of Field Experience

Student response to this section of the questionnaire was tabulated and is presented in two general tables.

1. Personal characteristics and high energy level.
2. Shared office space and need for a vehicle.

Table XXXIV outlines the responses of students regarding their perceptions of the need for a high personal energy elvel and the need for specific personal characteristics. Characteristics outlined in the table include "normal and healthy, no physical disabilities with the ability to participate actively." The two categories were established based on student responses and terminology.

The portion of the table referring to personal characteristics shows a response of 50%. This is a positive response indicating that one half of the students contacted saw these characteristics as necessary for their field experience. Of this group, 75% were Mount Royal College students and 25% were University of Calgary students.

Mount Royal College students reported a higher involvement in such activities as supervising activity hours, helping with dinner, wrestling with the boys and other comments to indicate a "physical" contact with clients. It appears that this involvement, not reported to near the same extent by university students, would explain why Mount Royal College students focussed as they did on the need for physical mobility.

TABLE XXXIV

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE REGARDING PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS* AND THE NEED FOR A HIGH PERSONAL ENERGY LEVEL**

Necessary	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Personal Characteristics						
Yes	51	50	33	75	18	25
Need High Energy Level						
Yes	34	33	5	11	29	48

* Personal Characteristics refer to normal and health, no physical disabilities, able to participate actively.

** High Personal Energy Level here referred to the need for endurance and physical mobility.

In the category reporting a "need for a high energy level", the University students represent 85% of those who indicate this need. This Table also supports previous data that indicated the University of Calgary students feel a significant amount of pressure and strain and that without a high energy level the student would not be able to meet the requirements as perceived by the students. Mount Royal College students did not see the need for emphasis to a major extent.

This point has been made several times in this research and will only be referred to again in the summary section of the Chapter and in the Conclusions and Recommendations Chapter.

Shared Office Space, Need for Vehicle

Students need a place to call "home" during their placement. They also must be able to get to the agency to participate in the program. This section reflects students' views of their stated need in regard to office space, telephone, audio-visual equipment and need for a vehicle.

Regarding the need to shared office space, telephone and audio-visual equipment, Table XXXV (category 1) shows that only University of Calgary students saw this as a concern. There were no Mount Royal College responses that mentioned this category of needs. One could surmise that adequate physical facilities are available in terms of equipment and space and no problems are perceived by Mount Royal College students in this regard.

Of The University of Calgary students reporting (57% of total student population), 95% noted a need to have private space. This concern was expressed with the clear understanding that this was not the best idea. Students commented "we need some personal space", and "I found it impossible to do interviews or have personal discussions in the office because there was someone else there."

These students strongly suggested that private space was necessary for their field experience to be more effective because lack of privacy created client-student communication difficulty.

TABLE XXXV

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF PHYSICAL REQUIREMENTS DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE IN RELATION TO SHARED OFFICE SPACE, VEHICLE AUDIO-VISUAL EQUIPMENT

Need	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Category 1*						
Yes	57	55	-	-	57	95
Category 2**						
Yes	36	35	3	7	33	55

* Need to share office space, telephone and audio-visual equipment.

** Need for vehicle or bus.

Other data also supports the suggestion that inadequate office space during field experience is a basis for unhappiness on the part of the student during his/her field experience. Candid comments include: "I really enjoyed the placement but there was no privacy at all", another noted "Everything was fine but I couldn't really talk privately - actually that's the only complaint I have." These comments were from the university students' perspective.

Category 2 of Table XXXV shows the students perceived need for a vehicle (car or bus) during the field experience. The need for bus was mentioned three times by Mount Royal College students in second year and a car was not noted. Of the 36 students recording the need for a car or bus, 33 were University of Calgary students who mentioned the car specifically as a definite need during field experience.

The location of placements has a direct bearing on these results. Many students did not mention the need for transportation at all (65% of total student population). For those, they may feel that transportation is strictly their responsibility and not worth mentioning. It is clear that those who did respond preferred and mentioned the need for a car over bus service.

Student Perceptions of Working Conditions - Subjective Basis

Data was sought to indicate the "feelings" students have about their placement. Subjective comments recorded from the data included words such as good, bad, fair, warm, cold, cooperative, etc.

Table XXXVI records the students' subjective perceptions regarding working conditions from two perspectives. One relates to feelings of excellent to poor and secondly feelings of cooperativeness to coldness and no time for reflection. Seventy six percent of the student population studied reported their working conditions as excellent, good or fair with 68% rating the working conditions as good or excellent.

This data suggests that a good majority of the students enjoy their placement and do, in fact, perceive it as a "good" field experience. There was also a very low "no response", recorded (9%) which indicates the students did want to comment on this factor. One enthusiastic student commented "my supervisor was great! My placement was great! " Another simply stated, "I couldn't have asked for a better experience."

Table XXXVI also shows the students perception of feelings of warmth and friendliness, cooperativeness, coldness and an indication of no time for reflection. There was a high "no response" recorded by the student population (30%). However, 55% of the total population studied felt the placement provided a cooperative and warm and friendly environment.

TABLE XXXVI

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF WORKING CONDITIONS DURING FIELD PLACEMENT RATED ON A SUBJECTIVE BASIS

Perceptions	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
(1)						
Excellent	24	23	12	27	12	20
Good	46	45	22	50	24	40
Fair	8	8	3	7	5	8
Poor	15	15	2	5	13	22
No Response	11	9	5	11	6	10
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100
(2)						
Cooperative	23	22	6	13	17	28
Warm and Friendly	34	33	12	27	22	37
Coldness	3	3	-	-	3	6
No Time for Reflection	12	12	1	3	11	18
No Response	32	30	25	57	7	11
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

Mount Royal College Students did not report dissatisfaction with the working environment nor did The University of Calgary students.

Twelve percent of the overall population responding did mention "no time for reflection." Of this figure, all but one respondent was a university student in fourth year. "No time for reflection" refers to the students' statements saying they would have appreciated "just some time to think and reflect on what I'm learning."

The data shows that 68% of the total student population felt that their placement was excellent or good. However, data also shows that 15 students rated their placement as poor - of this 15, thirteen were university students.

Note is also made that only three university students indicated a "cold" environment. A majority of the total student population saw their placement as "excellent to good, cooperative and warm and friendly."

The expression of satisfaction is important here because it indicates that most students had a good experience and left their placement with good feelings. This contributes to growth and development of the student and hopefully assists the agency achieve its objectives.

Responsibility

Data in regard to the "responsibility" section of the questionnaire was categorized and includes statements of responsibility to client, educational institution and agency as well as to self and agency staff. No attempt was made to priorize the response, only to report it.

Student Feeling of Responsibility to Client, Educational Institution and Agency

This section sought to encourage comments that would describe the attitude of students toward responsibility in general during field experience. Table XXXVII records the students' attitude toward responsibility to the client, the educational system and to the agency in which field experience took place. The Table shows that the students indicate their responsibility is to meet the needs and objectives of the client and the agency first and the needs of the educational institution second.

TABLE XXXVII

STUDENT FEELING OF RESPONSIBILITY TO CLIENT, EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION AND TO AGENCY DURING FIELD PLACEMENT

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
To Client	44	40	18	40	26	37
To Educational Institution	11	11	2	5	9	13
To Agency	54	49	18	40	36	50
No Response	-	-	6	15	-	-
Total	109*	100	44	100	71*	100

* This Table indicates that some student responses recorded more than one category in response to their feeling of responsibility. Students specifically in The University of Calgary responded more than once.

Of all of the students recorded, 11% saw a responsibility to the educational institution as a role obligation. The majority of these students were University of Calgary students.

There is a reasonably clear indication that students place responsibility to client and agency above responsibility to educational institution and yet a factor with The University of Calgary student is that he must place educational institution priorities high because of the academic demands placed upon him. The possibility of divided loyalties is evident for a student who wishes to excell in his field placement and also in his academic courses.

Student Response Regarding Feeling of Responsibility to Self and Agency Staff

Many students' responses indicated that they did have priorities relating to themselves and agency staff. Some felt they were responsible to agency staff but felt more responsible to the client or to the agency itself than any one staff in the particular system.

Table XXXVIII shows that a higher percentage of students (32%) see a responsibility to themselves during field experience, where 13% see a responsibility to agency staff personnel.

TABLE XXXVIII

STUDENT FEELING OF RESPONSIBILITY TO SELF AND TO AGENCY STAFF DURING FIELD EXPERIENCE

Responsibility	Total		Mount Royal		Univ. of Calgary	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
To Self	33	32	14	32	19	33
To Agency Staff	14	13	3	7	11	17
No Response	57	55	27	61	30	50
Total	104	100	44	100	60	100

There was a reasonably high "no response" recorded (55%) of which the majority were Mount Royal College students.

Comparing this Table with Table XXXVII of student perceptions of responsibility to client, educational institution and agency, we see that students feel a high responsibility to client (40%) and agency (40%) and a reasonably low responsibility to agency staff (7%). This could infer that the student feels a greater commitment to the client and agency objectives but the student feels a lesser responsibility to individual staff objectives and goals.

Basically, students report a feeling of higher responsibility to the client, agency and self during field experience than responsibility to their educational institution or to the staff of the agency. This is important because agency staff and faculty may not show this perspective. A possibility of conflict of expectations is evident and should perhaps be explored with further study in this area.

Student Perceptions Related to Personal Satisfaction

The writer wanted data that would show what personal satisfaction (if any) was achieved by students during field experience. Student responses were categorized into: a great deal of satisfaction, learning experience and feeling of accomplishment, demanding work load and not satisfied, and new skills, friends, insight and self-confidence.

Table XXXIX summarizes students' statements of satisfaction with field experience.

Thirty six percent (64 students) of the responses indicated a great deal of personal satisfaction. The majority stating this perception were University of Calgary students. The University of Calgary students also saw a feeling of accomplishment and a learning experience as important aspects of their field experience in almost the same proportion as did Mount Royal College students (31% - 29%).

However, The University of Calgary students made a point that the demanding work load was not satisfying. Twenty one percent of The University of Calgary student group mentioned this factor while the Table indicates that only 2% of the Mount Royal College student group shared this perception of personal dissatisfaction during field experience.

TABLE XXXIX

STUDENT SATISFACTION WITH FIELD EXPERIENCE

Satisfaction	Total No.	Total %	Mount Royal No.	Mount Royal %	Univ. of Calgary No.	Univ. of Calgary %
Great Deal of Personal Satisfaction	64	36	28	42	36	33
Learning, Experience & Feeling of Accomplishment	54	30	20	29	34	31
Demand Work Load - Not Satisfied	24	15	1	2	23	21
New Skills, Friends, Insights & Self-Confidence	34	19	18	27	16	15
No Response	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	176*	100	67*	100	109*	100

* One hundred and four (104) students recorded 176 responses.

This Table appears to support the other Tables that indicated The University of Calgary students perceived a need for higher personal energy level (Table XXXIV) and a need to have stability and ability to cope under personal stress (Table XXXIII). Also Table XXXVII, referring to students' perceptions of their responsibility for assignments and meetings with academic supervisors indicated that a demanding work load could be seen as a criticism of the program for University of Calgary students.

Generally, Mount Royal College students rated a perception of higher personal satisfaction and acquired skills, friends and insights more often than did University of Calgary students. The two student groups saw a sense of accomplishment and learning experience opportunity basically the same (20% - 31%), but differed greatly regarding perception of their demanding work load factor.

The data suggest that Mount Royal College students appear to state higher personal satisfaction rating than do The University of Calgary students. One would surmise that the difference in philosophy related to academic demand may be a vital variable. Further study would greatly assist in this regard.

Summary Comments of Field Experience - Mount Royal College Student Data

Mount Royal College students generally reported little responsibility for counselling but did note a major responsibility for interviewing, assessment and behaviour coding. These students did not mention academic demands as a factor but did indicate a role in research oriented activities.

Students expressed the view that site visitations were a responsibility during field experience and indicated that record writing and reporting was extremely important. The significance here is that skills training in record writing, for example, are required prior to the beginning of the field experience.

The need for personal traits such as understanding, patience and tolerance was expressed as well as the need for skills of assessment, objectivity, honesty and awareness. Ability to get involved and have the initiative and ability to work on one's own were also specified as important during field experience by college students.

Students referred to a need for "normalness" (no physical handicaps) and personal good health and ability to participate actively.

Mount Royal College students generally were satisfied with placement working conditions and rated them good to excellent. They did not mention problems with shared office space or need for transportation to or from placement or indicate problems with excessive academic loads.

College students rated their personal responsibility as client first, self second, agency third. Agency staff and responsibility to the educational institution were at the end of the list of Mount Royal College students.

Summary Comments Field Experience - The University of Calgary Student Data

The data does suggest that University of Calgary students are more closely supervised in their field experience than their Mount Royal College peers. They seem to have more responsibilities and academic expectations to live up to and they report substantial feelings of personal pressure during placement.

University students note a need to integrate knowledge and practice. They also feel more stress and report a need of a high personal energy level. They generally do not like the heavy academic demands which they feel affect their work in the field experience.

Some university students have responsibility for family and individual counselling during field experience. The students also perceive themselves to have a large number of staff and volunteer meetings to attend and do also attend many interdisciplinary meetings. They see themselves doing a great deal of clerical work and report writing and record keeping. They see a need to display stability with the ability to make decisions while under stress.

University of Calgary students see a need to share offices during placement but feel this is detrimental to the service they could render. They also see a need for a car.

The University of Calgary students see their primary responsibilities as first to agency, second to client, third to self, fourth to educational institution and fifth to agency staff. The low priority placed on responsibility to the educational institution gives rise to a possible confusion of priorities between students and institutions during field experience.

The University of Calgary students felt more dissatisfaction with field experience than did Mount Royal College students because of the reported demanding work load. However, the majority reported a high sense of accomplishment at having learned something, and felt the working conditions at the placements were good to excellent.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary and Conclusions

This study compared two social work programs from the perspective of participating instructors, agency supervisors, and students. The aim of the study was to identify essential components of a field training program which might be generalized from social work to community development.

Overall, the results reflect strong support for field work as a desirable requirement in the preparation of social workers. Instructors, supervisors, and students perceive field training as the means of providing a number of important learning opportunities associated with the reality of the field. Such opportunities were:

1. Opportunities to relate theory and conceptual learning to real situations so as to develop a more accurate understanding of the field.
2. Opportunities to apply and practice skills learned in classes.
3. Opportunities to develop decision making skills and judgment in dealing with professional and political problems and situations.
4. Opportunities to relate personally to the field and develop an identification with the field.

In spite of the sense of commitment to field work which was apparent in the data, some areas of concern were identified as well. There seemed to be a lack of general agreement as to the nature of the field work experience. Apparently specific expectations regarding goals, methods and responsibilities were not clearly understood by all of the persons involved in field work. Such a lack of clear expectations could diminish the effectiveness of field experiences and dilute the commitment to it by both students and professionals.

Though student data show a general satisfaction with the field work experience, they indicate that The University of Calgary students experience considerably greater academic demands during their practicums than Mount Royal College students. It would seem that the longer program imposes greater expectations on its students, in line with their greater theoretical background. These differences in background could lead to frustration for Mount Royal College students who are expected to perform similar functions in their practicums as would be expected of a university student.

The results do indicate some concerns regarding placement procedures and the nature of placements. Apparently, agency supervisors and students would prefer to have more choice regarding placements. They also seem inclined toward block placements rather than a usual one-day-per-week framework. Block placements would allow for greater continuity, with the result that the field experience would be more real, the student's identification with the field more complete, and his/her relationship to his/her supervisor more consistent.

Another concern identified in the data was that field oriented programs might tend to have a lower priority than academic programs in an academic institution. The implication of this concern is that instructors might tend to be less commited to field work than they would like to be, because of job insecurity or an actual lack of funds to staff and implement an adequate field program.

A final observation arising out of the data is that faculty and agency personnel seem to have a fairly subjective impression of what makes a good supervisor. Their emphasis was not necessarily on academic qualifications, but rather on a person's ability to be a model and his interest in learning, teaching, and supervising. This would suggest that social work practicums could be supervised by people who are effective in their field even if they lacked formal qualifications.

Recommendations

The above conclusions lead to a number of general recommendations to social work programs regarding field work training:

1. That field work be included or retained as part of the preparation of social workers.
2. That schools and agencies involved in field work training jointly specify their expectations regarding field work. This would include clarification of general goals and specific objectives, alternative means for implementing the objectives, means of evaluating success, and designation of responsibilities.
3. That social work schools identify several levels of training and the types of practicum experiences which would allow for practical experience at the specified levels. For example, a first-year student might be expected to act as a recording secretary or an information dispenser for a social service agency, while a fourth-year student might be expected to do in-depth interviewing or counselling during his field work. [In either event, the task would be defined explicitly enough to allow the student to know what is expected of him and to allow the supervisor to evaluate the student's performance.]

4. That students and supervisors be involved to a greater extent in the selection of specific placements, preferably according to their level of training and their personal field work goals.
5. That social work schools seek a commitment from their institutions to the principle of field work together with a corresponding financial commitment for staffing and implementing the program.
6. That specific institution and agency staff be designated exclusively for the implementation and supervision of the field experience program. This action would enhance and improve communication channels between the agency staff and faculty and considerably clarify all relationships among faculty, agency staff and students.
7. That regular meetings be held between agency supervisors, instructional staff, and students to maintain an open communication regarding problems and progress.
8. That schools incorporate into their programs more complete skill training in areas such as parliamentary procedure, recording of minutes, and writing reports, as well as communication and human relations skills training.

To the extent that these recommendations relate to the general framework of a field training program for social work, they would be appropriate as guidelines for community development as well. However, the specific implications of some of these guidelines would differ for community development because its focus is on the sociological nature of organizations and the needs of society, whereas the focus of social work training is on the needs of the individual in the society. This would especially influence recommendations 2 and 3, since the objectives for community development would relate to changing social systems rather than individuals. Thus the tasks and expectations would revolve around social action and social change rather than individual action and individual change. Likewise, placement settings may differ in the two fields although it is conceivable that a single agency may have appropriate staff and functions to allow for practicum experiences for students in both community development and social work.

The reality is that a student of Community Development would have a different set of expectations defined for his field experience. He would be trained for different purposes, utilizing different skills. He would require a supervisor who understood and accepted the need for an extended "time frame" for change. And finally he would be evaluated utilizing different criteria for success.

The need for field experience during community development training is recognized and encouraged by this author. Many opportunities for personal growth and maturity can occur during field placement. The major concern surfacing is that we must not transfer the methods used in one field directly to another field.

This study suggests many similarities between social work training and community development training but the study must conclude that we cannot transfer the findings directly to the field of Community Development.

The study does indicate more research is necessary in Community Development to define the rationale for a sound field experience program as a graduating requirement for a professional Community Development worker.

It appears that students and professionals in social work strongly endorse the value of field work programs in professional training. It is suggested that the recommendation portion of this study may assist in providing a beginning frame of reference that could be applicable to the Community Development field for future study.

Future studies in Community Development related to field experience might address themselves to such areas as: objectives of field experience; forms, procedure, and methods of placement; staff-student ratio in field experience and financing the field experience program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, D., University of Calgary Printout, School of Social Work, 1973.

Bannon, Joseph, J., Recreation Education and the Community College, Draft copy of a position paper prepared for Society of Professional Recreation Educators, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill., Champaigh, January 1974.

Beaverstock, A. G., Apprenticeship Training Industrial Training Handbook.

Boehm, Werner, The Social Casework Method in Social Work Education, Social Work Curriculum Study, Vol. X, New York: Council on Social Work Education.

Calendar, Mount Royal College, Lincoln Park Campus, Social Work.

Calendar, The University of Calgary, Social Work Program, 1973-74.

Collins, Mildred, Some Conflicts of Issues in Field Teaching, Social Service Department, Victoria General Hospital, Halifax, N.S., 1969.

Garrett, Maxwell, A Study of Current Recreation Internship and Field Training Programs at Selected Educational Institutes and Public Agencies, Urbana, Illinois, Department of Recreation and Park Administration, University of Illinois, 1968.

Gurin, Arnold, Report on C.S.W.E. Community Organization Curriculum Development Project, Paper to C.S.W.E. 16th Annual Program Meeting, Minneapolis, Minn., January 1968.

Highroads Dictionary, Royal School Series, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Irving, Howard, H., Social Science Approach to a Problem in Field Instruction, Journal of Education for Social Work, 1969-1970.

Law Society of Alberta, Rules of the Law Society, Revised March 1971, Calgary, Alberta.

Labour Gazette, Canada Department of Labour, September 1969.

McDonald, Merrill, Extension Education Division, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, personal conversation, May, 1974.

Miller, Delbert, C., Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, Second Edition, David McKay Company, Inc., New York, 1970.

Miller, Melvin, D., Field Experience - Preparation to Cope, Adult Leadership, January 1972.

Mount Royal College, Course Outline, Social Work Careers - Field Placement, May 1974.

O'Banion, Terry, The Junior College: The Positive Approach, Momco paper, University of Illinois, College of Education, undated.

Patterson, J. G., Sawatsky, D. D., Oliva, F. D., Summary Report Description and Follow-up of Trainees from Social Service Programs in Colleges and Technical Institutes in the Province of Alberta, Social Services Education Special Research Project, Alberta Colleges Commission, 1972.

Pettes, Dorothy, E., Supervision of Social Work, George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1967.

Report of the Special Committee on Legal Education 1972, Law Society of Upper Canada, Osgood Hall, University of Toronto.

Rogers, Martha E., Education Revolution in Nursing, The MacMillan Co., New York, Butt-MacMillan Ltd., Gault, Ontario, 1961.

Toward Excellence in Nursing Education, National League for Nursing, New York, 1964.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE - FIELD PLACEMENT SUPERVISORS

Mount Royal College __________

The University of Calgary __________

SECTION A

Name ____________________

Number of Students Supervised ____________________

Number of Agency Supervisors under your supervision __________

Educational Level Achieved ____________________

Please outline in some detail years working experience in social work field:

SECTION B

1. As a staff member, what part did you play regarding:

    a. The creation of the objectives of the field placement program of Mount Royal College/University of Calgary

    b. Finding placements for students.

    c. Placing of the individual students to a specific agency.

    d. Counselling of students while in their placements (Please specify approximately amount of time with each student).

    e. Meeting agency supervisors prior to placements.

    f. Meeting agency supervisors after placements.

2. For the students under your supervision what methods did you use to encourage the students to consider:

    a. Principles of social work.

    b. The use of interpersonal skills.

    c. Essentials of interviewing.

    d. Systematic approach to problem solving.

    e. Diagnosis and treatment planning.

    f. Local (action) resources and their utilization.

    g. Mechanical skills of report writing, record keeping, referral procedure, and inter-agency correspondence.

3. In what manner were students introduced to their field placement?

4. Is there a budget for the field placement programs?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If yes, are you aware of how much that budget is? Yes _____

   No _____

5. In your opinion, were the objectives of field placement as listed above achieved? Yes _____ No ____ Explain.

6. Are the agency supervisors, in your pinion, able to give time and proper supervision to students? Please explain.

7. Would you please describe in your own words the "ideal agency field placement supervisor", relating to such factors as: age, sex, academic qualifications, personal skills, work background, personality characteristics.

8. In your opinion, are there skills learned during field placement that cannot be taught in the classroom? Please explain.

9. In your opinion, does the field placement simply become a winter or summer job for the student from his point of view? Please explain.

10. In your opinion, does the Social Work Profession in general see field work as an important part of professional preparation? Please explain.

Thank you for your help and cooperation. Your opinion will be confidential.

Gerald A. Bruce
Surveyor

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE - AGENCY SUPERVISORS OF FIELD PLACEMENT

Mount Royal College ________

The University of Calgary ________

SECTION A

NAME ________________________________

AGENCY ________________________________

NUMBER OF STUDENTS SUPERVISED ________________

COLLEGE CONTACT PERSON ________________

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ACHIEVED ________________

Please outline in some detail years working experience in social work field:

SECTION B

1. In what manner were you invited to assist the field work program at Mount Royal College/The University of Calgary?

2. In what manner were you made aware of the objectives of the field placement program of the college?

3. What methods were used to determine the objectives of your agency in assisting the field work placement program of the college/university?

4. In what manner were you and the student(s) brought together at the beginning of the placement?

5. Please explain what methods were agreed upon regarding:

   a. Evaluation of student progress:

   b. Supervision of student practice:

c. Reports from students personally:

d. Recording progress and marking of records: (example - log book)

6. Were you pleased with the way the field placement program was organized? Please explain.

7. Are there changes you would recommend for 1973-74? Explain.

SECTION C

In your opinion:

1. Was the student(s) under your supervision exposed to:

   a. the principles of social work Yes _____ No _____ Explain.

   b. the use of interpersonal skills Yes _____ No _____ Explain.

   c. the essentials of interviewing Yes _____ No _____ Explain.

   d. systematic approach to problem solving Yes _____ No _____ Explain.

   e. diagnosis and treatment planning Yes _____ No _____ Explain.

   f. local (action) resources and their utilization Yes _____ No _____ Explain.

2. Is there a budget for field placement responsibilities in your agency? Yes _____ No _____ Explain.

3. Approximately how much time did you personally spend with your student(s)?

4. Were these meeting times with students scheduled? If so, please explain.

5. In your opinion, are these skills learned during field placement that cannot be taught in a classroom? Please explain.

6. In your opinion, does the field placement simply become a winter or summer job for the student from his point of view? Please explain.

7. In your opinion, does the social work profession in general see field work as an important part of professional preparation? Please explain.

Thank you for your help and cooperation. Your responses will be kept confidential.

Gerald A. Bruce
Surveyor

APPENDIX C

FIELD WORK SURVEY

Surveyor: Gerald A. Bruce
8612 Atlas Dr. S.E.,
Calgary, Alberta.

This is a Survey for information regarding your Field Work Placement. Please complete the description of your duties in your own words using only the guide posts provided on the form.

Student's Name ______________________________

College ____________ University ____________ (check one)

Name of Placement ____________________ Job Title ____________

Date ____________ Age ________ Year of Program 1 2 3 4 Masters
(circle one)

Agency Supervisor ______________________________

Job Summary: Please state clearly the job (or jobs) you do as part of your field work obligation.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

Routine or Daily Obligations ______________________________

____

____

____

____

Periodic Duties

Occasional Duties

Mental Requirements of Field Placement

Physical Requirements of Field Placement

Working Conditions

Responsibility

Personal Satisfaction Related to Placement

I appreciate your completing the survey and wish you all the best in your future activities.

APPENDIX D

TYPICAL DAY FIELD WORK SURVEY

Surveyor: Gerald A. Bruce
8612 Atlas Dr. S.E.,
Calgary, Alberta.

Name ______________________________

Placement ______________________________

Please describe a typical day at your field placement

(where applicable).

9:00 am - 9:15 am ______________________________

9:15 am - 9:30 am ______________________________

9:30 am - 9:45 am ______________________________

9:45 am - 10:00 am ______________________________

10:00 am - 10:15 am ______________________________

10:15 am - 10:30 am ______________________________

10:30 am - 10:45 am

10:45 am - 11:00 am

11:00 am - 11:15 am

11:15 am - 11:30 am

11:45 am - 12:00 n

1:00 pm - 1:15 pm

1:15 pm - 1:30 pm

1:30 pm - 1:45 pm

1:45 pm - 2:00 pm

2:00 pm - 2:15 pm

2:15 pm - 2:30 pm

2:30 pm - 2:45 pm

2:45 pm - 3:00 pm

3:00 pm - 3:15 pm

3:15 pm - 3:30 pm

3:30 pm - 3:45 pm

3:45 pm - 4:00 pm

4:00 pm - 4:15 pm

4:15 pm - 4:30 pm

4:30 pm - 4:45 pm

4:45 pm - 5:00 pm

5:00 pm - 5:15 pm

5:15 pm - 5:30 pm

5:30 pm - 5:45 pm

5:45 pm - 6:00 pm

6:00 pm - 6:15 pm

6:15 pm - 6:30 pm

6:30 pm - 6:45 pm

6:45 pm - 7:00 pm

7:00 pm - 7:15 pm

7:15 pm - 7:30 pm

7:30 pm - 7:45 pm

7:45 pm - 8:00 pm

8:00 pm - 8:15 pm

8:15 pm - 8:30 pm

8:30 pm - 8:45 pm

8:45 pm - 9:00 pm

9:00 pm - 9:15 pm

9:15 pm - 9:30 pm

9:30 pm - 9:45 pm

9:45 pm - 10:00 pm

10:00 pm - 10:15 pm ____________________

____

____

10:15 pm - 10:30 pm ____________________

____

____

APPENDIX E

8612 Atlas Drive S.E.,
Calgary, Alberta
April 11, 1973

DEAR STUDENT:

My name is Gerald A. Bruce. I am a student in the Interdisciplinary Masters of Arts in Community Development Program at the University of Alberta under the Faculty of Graduate Studies. I hope to complete my degree requirements by June of 1973. Your cooperation in filling out the two survey forms distributed is requested and sincerely appreciated.

I hope to gather data that will describe what you, as a student, actually do to fulfill your field requirements. The two forms you receive are designed to allow you to describe in your own words and from your point of view, your reaction to your field work experience. One form asks for a general written description of your field placement job, the other for a fifteen minute breakdown of a typical placement day.

Please be assured that your comments will not affect any mark or standing in your class and would you please interpret the words used in the survey as you would normally interpret them. The two forms should not require more than 15 to 20 minutes of your very valuable time.

Please return your forms to Miss Francis Roessingh, c/o Social Services Department, Resource Island "A", Mount Royal College. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Gerald A. Bruce

GAB;bfo
enclosure